Calendar No. 91

99TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
99–41

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1029]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL LEVELS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

APRIL 29 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1985.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
45-603 O WASHINGTON : 1985

S203-2

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
JOHN P. EAST, North Carolina
PETE WILSON, California
JEREMIAH DENTON, Alabama
PHIL GRAMM, Texas

SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
GARY HART, Colorado
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
JOHN GLENN, Ohio

JAMES F. MCGOVERN, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*
ALAN R. YUSPEH, *General Counsel*
CHRISTINE C. DAUTH, *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Page
- Purpose of the bill ... 1
- Budget impact of the committee bill ... 2
- Summary of funds and manpower authorized in committee bill ... 3
- Highlights of committee action ... 8
    - Procurement ... 8
    - Research and development ... 10
    - Operation and maintenance ... 11
    - Manpower ... 11
    - Defense procurement improvements ... 12
- Summary of notifications, reports or studies requested ... 12
- Division A—Department of Defense Authorization ... 15
- Title I—Procurement ... 15
- Background on procurement authorization ... 15
- Summary of recommended funding charges ... 15
- Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1986 procurement authorization request ... 15
    - Aircraft procurement, Army ... 16
    - Missile procurement, Army ... 20
    - Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army ... 23
    - Procurement of ammunition, Army ... 28
    - Other procurement, Army ... 34
    - Aircraft procurement, Navy ... 45
    - Weapons procurement, Navy ... 54
    - Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy ... 62
    - Other procurement, Navy ... 74
    - Procurement, Marine Corps ... 85
    - Aircraft procurement, Air Force ... 90
    - Missile procurement, Air Force ... 99
    - Other procurement, Air Force ... 109
    - Procurement, Defense Agencies ... 118
    - Procurement, National Guard and Reserve ... 119
- Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation ... 124
- Background on research and development authorization ... 124
- Summary of recommended funding changes ... 124
- Summary of adjustments to fiscal year 1986 RDT&E authorization request ... 124
    - Research, development, test and evaluation, Army ... 128
    - Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy ... 136
    - Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force ... 153
    - Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense Agencies ... 163
- Title III—Operation and Maintenance ... 168
    - O&M, Army ... 169
    - O&M, Navy ... 170
    - O&M, Marine Corps ... 171
    - O&M, Air Force ... 171
    - O&M, Defense Agencies ... 172
    - O&M, Army Reserve ... 173
    - O&M, Navy Reserve ... 173
    - O&M, Marine Corps Reserve ... 174
    - O&M, Air Force Reserve ... 174
    - O&M, Army National Guard ... 175
    - O&M, Air National Guard ... 175
- Other provisions ... 177
- Stock funds ... 180

Page

- Title IV—Personnel Authorization 183
  - Part A, Active Forces 183
  - Part B, Reserve Forces 185
  - Part C, Civilian Personnel 187
  - Part D, Military Training Student Loads 188
- Title V—Compensation and Other Benefits; Educational Assistance and Miscellaneous Personnel Matters 190
  - Part A, Pay and allowances 190
  - Part B, Extension of expiring bonus authority, benefits and personnel management authorities 193
  - Part C, Educational assistance programs 196
  - Part D, Miscellaneous personnel matters and benefits 199
- Title VI—Procurement Policy Reform and Other Procurement Matters 203
- Title VII—Department of Defense Efficiency and Economy Matters 215
- Title VIII—National Defense Stockpile 219
- Title IX—General Provisions 220
- Division B—Military Construction 230
- Title I—Army 257
- Title II—Navy 280
- Title III—Air Force 299
- Title IV—Defense Agencies 327
- Title V—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure NATO Authorization 333
- Title VI—Authorization of Appropriations and Administrative Provisions 334
- Title VII—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities 336
- Title VIII—General Provisions 338
- Division C—Department of Energy 342
- Division D—Civil Defense 353
- Departmental recommendations 354
- Committee action 402
- Fiscal data 403
- Congressional Budget Office letter and cost estimate 405
- Congressional action on procurement, RDT&E, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, special foreign currency, and civil defense authorization requests 413
- Relationship of annual authorization to Department of Defense appropriations 414
- Regulatory impact 416
- Changes in existing law 416
- Additional views of Mr. Cohen 417
- Additional views of Mr. Hart 419
- Additional views of Mr. Levin 423
- Additional views of Mr. Kennedy 426
- Additional views of Mr. Bingaman 430

Calendar No. 91

99th Congress, 1st Session | SENATE | Report 99-41

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL LEVELS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986, TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

April 29 (legislative day, April 15), 1985.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. Goldwater, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1029]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes, and other weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation, and operation and maintenance for the Armed Forces, and working capital funds, for civil defense, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength for each active duty component and the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces and the military training student loads, and for other purposes, and, recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the working capital funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986;

45-603 O

(2) authorize the personnel end strength for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1986;

(3) authorize the personnel average strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1986;

(4) authorize civilian end strengths for each military department of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986;

(5) authorize the annual average military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1986;

(6) impose certain reporting requirements;

(7) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and R.D.T. & E. actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, make certain changes to existing law, and for other purposes;

(8) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986;

(9) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1986; and

(10) authorize appropriations for civil defense, including programs of the Federal Energy Management Agency, for fiscal year 1986.

BUDGET IMPACT OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

The request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 1986 totals $322.2 billion in budget authority. Of this total request, $248.7 billion is requested for programs specifically authorized in the committee bill. These programs include procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, special foreign currency, military construction and family housing, weapons programs of the Department of Energy, and civil defense. The bill reported by the committee includes a recommended amount of approximately $240 billion for the above accounts, a reduction of $8.75 billion from the President's request.

The funding included in the bill may appear to be substantially less than the functional ceiling for national defense. The primary reason for this difference is that, although military and civilian end strengths require authorization in this bill, the actual funding for military pay and benefits (approximately $73 billion) is not reflected in this legislation. Factors which are not included in this bill, such as financing adjustments and related agency budgets, also contribute to the difference between the authorization bill total and the defense function total.

Actions of the committee to freeze military and civilian end strengths and to delay until January 1, 1986, the requested 3% military pay raise equate to an additional reduction of approximately $1.2 billion from the President's request. The committee also adopted legislative provisions relating to contract regulations and the Special Defense Acquisition Fund which result in a further reduction from the President's request of approximately $650 million. Therefore, the net impact of the bill on the President's request for national defense is a reduction of approximately $10.6 billion. An overall summary of the funding and manpower provisions of the bill follows:

SUMMARY OF FUNDS AND MANPOWER AUTHORIZED IN COMMITTEE BILL

[Dollar amounts in millions; totals may not add due to rounding]

	Fiscal year 1986 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
Procurement	$106,754	−$4,511	$102,244
RDT&E	39,280	−1,763	37,518
Operation and maintenance	82,450	−1,119	81,331
Working capital funds	1,860	0	1,860
Special foreign currency	2	0	2
Military construction	10,309	−1,154	9,155
DOE weapons program	7,959	−203	7,756
Civil defense	119	0	119
Total funding	248,734	−8,750	239,984
Manpower (in thousands):			
Active duty	2,178.1	−10.7	2,167.4
Selected Reserve	1,109.0	−12.9	1,096.1
Civilian	1,106.8	−19.0	1,087.8
Total manpower	4,393.9	−42.6	4,351.3

SUMMARY OF FUNDS RECOMMENDED FOR AUTHORIZATION
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

	FISCAL YEAR 1985 BUDGET AUTHORITY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
DIVISION A				
PROCUREMENT				
Army:				
Aircraft	3,901,300	3,892,500	-120,000	3,772,500
Missiles	3,158,300	3,386,700	-5,000	3,381,700
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles	4,548,100	5,739,100	-386,000	5,353,100
Ammunition	2,646,300	2,635,000	-43,700	2,591,300
Other Procurement	5,122,450	5,712,800	-61,100	5,651,700
Total, Army Procurement	19,376,450	21,366,100	-615,800	20,750,300
Navy:				
Aircraft	10,903,798	12,062,600	-471,300	11,591,300
Weapons	4,353,611	5,627,900	25,600	5,653,500
Shipbuilding and Conversion	11,620,826	11,411,600	-637,900	10,773,700
Other Procurement	5,341,614	6,601,200	-716,500	5,884,700
Marine Corps	1,836,722	1,726,800	-47,000	1,679,800
Total, Navy Procurement	34,056,571	37,430,100	-1,847,100	35,583,000
Air Force:				
Aircraft	26,078,066	26,165,500	-1,019,400	25,146,100
Missiles	6,888,345	10,862,700	-1,136,900	9,725,800
Other Procurement	8,848,127	9,538,000	-202,400	9,335,600
Total, Air Force Procurement	41,814,538	46,566,200	-2,358,700	44,207,500
Defense Agencies Procurement	1,169,301	1,391,900	-1,100	1,390,800
National Guard and Reserve Procurement	380,000	0	312,000	312,000
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	96,796,860	106,754,300	-4,510,700	102,243,600
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION				
Army	4,376,115	5,279,900	-323,697	4,956,203
Navy (including Marine Corps)	9,274,106	11,264,300	-485,717	10,778,583
Air Force	13,506,347	15,578,500	-616,859	14,961,641
Defense Agencies	4,307,207	7,157,400	-336,234	6,821,166
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION	31,463,775	39,280,100	-1,762,507	37,517,593
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
Army	18,603,698	20,190,630	-277,120	19,913,510
Navy	25,334,741	25,797,700	-335,917	25,461,783
Marine Corps	1,650,894	1,667,400	-12,944	1,654,456
Air Force	19,213,465	20,924,400	-444,744	20,479,656
Defense Agencies	7,182,599	7,568,900	3,112	7,572,012

	FISCAL YEAR 1985 BUDGET AUTHORITY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Army Reserve	732,700	779,600	9,142	788,742
Naval Reserve	828,781	954,500	-28,908	925,592
Marine Corps Reserve	58,842	61,600	-2,860	58,740
Air Force Reserve	881,261	907,700	-9,773	897,927
Army National Guard	1,439,293	1,605,200	4,356	1,609,556
Air National Guard	1,828,848	1,830,100	-8,724	1,821,376
Rifle Practice, Defense	928	920	0	920
Claims, Defense	146,500	158,300	-15,000	143,300
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	2,870	3,200	0	3,200
Environmental Restoration Fund	314,000	0	0	0
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	78,219,420	82,450,150	-1,119,380	81,330,770
WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS				
Army Stock Fund	366,448	442,000	0	442,000
Navy Stock Fund	473,307	716,500	0	716,500
Marine Corps Stock Fund	34,908	42,700	0	42,700
Air Force Stock Fund	548,593	464,900	0	464,900
Defense Stock Fund	130,700	193,500	0	193,500
TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	1,553,956	1,859,600	0	1,859,600
SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY				
Army		0	0	0
Navy		1,600	0	1,600
Air Force		0	0	0
Defense Agencies		500	0	500
TOTAL, SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY	8,650	2,100	0	2,100
TOTAL, DIVISION A	208,042,661	230,346,250	-7,392,587	222,953,663
DIVISION B				
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				
Army	1,593,137	2,023,910	-345,440	1,678,470
Navy/Marine Corps	1,534,592	2,147,510	-375,100	1,772,410
Air Force	1,572,655	1,973,350	-278,160	1,695,190
Defense Agencies	302,198	309,600	-82,900	226,700
NATO Infrastructure	107200	98,000	0	98,000
Army National Guard	98,603	102,100	0	102,100
Air National Guard	111,200	137,200	-7,145	130,055
Army Reserve	69,306	70,700	200	70,900
Naval Reserve	60,800	51,800		51,800
Air Force Reserve	67,800	66,800		66,800
TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	5,517,491	6,980,970	-1,088,545	5,892,425

	FISCAL YEAR 1985 BUDGET AUTHORITY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
FAMILY HOUSING				
Army	1,331,817	1,625,764	-66,971	1,558,793
Navy	659,282	738,739	3,100	741,839
Air Force	885,565	943,698	-1,800	941,898
Defense Agencies	17,437	20,300	0	20,300
TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING	2,894,101	3,328,501	-65,671	3,262,830
TOTAL, DIVISION B	8,411,592	10,309,471	-1,154,216	9,155,255
DIVISION C				
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS				
Weapons Activities	4,230,180	4,542,090	-109,100	4,432,990
Verification and Control Technology	76,700	93,575	10,000	103,575
Materials Production	1,738,300	1,947,900	-63,000	1,884,900
Defense Waste and By-Products Management	723,571	712,820	-41,000	671,820
Nuclear Safeguards and Security	62,700	59,925	0	59,925
Security Investigations	34,000	33,400	0	33,400
Naval Reactors Development	496,900	569,000	0	569,000
TOTAL, DIVISION C	7,362,351	7,958,710	-203,100	7,755,610
DIVISION D				
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM	179,547	119,125	0	119,125
GRAND TOTAL OF BILL	223,996,151	248,733,556	-8,749,903	239,983,653

ACTIVE DUTY MANPOWER, FISCAL YEAR 1986

(End strength in thousands)

	Fiscal year 1986 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Army	780.8	780.8	0
Navy	586.3	581.3	-5.0
Marine Corps	199.5	198.8	- .7
Air Force	611.5	606.5	-5.0
TOTAL	2,178.1	2,167.4	-10.7

SELECTED RESERVE PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEAR 1986

(Average strength in thousands)

	Fiscal year 1986 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Army National Guard	444.0	438.4	-5.6
Army Reserve	291.9	288.8	-3.1
Naval Reserve	134.4	131.3	-3.1
Marine Corps Reserve	41.9	41.8	- .1
Air National Guard	108.7	107.9	- .8
Air Force Reserve	75.6	75.4	- .2
Coast Guard Reserve	12.5	12.5	0
TOTAL	1,109.0	1,096.1	-12.9

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEAR 1986

(End strength in thousands)

	Fiscal year 1986 request	Recommendation	Change from request
Department of Defense	1,106.8	1,087.8	-19.0

HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The committee recommends a total of approximately $240 billion to be authorized for procurement, research and development, operation and maintenance, working capital funds, special foreign currency, military construction and family housing, DOE weapons programs, and civil defense for fiscal year 1986. Additions and reductions highlighted below are from the President's budget request.

PROCUREMENT

Approval of most of the Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion request, including four SSN-688 class nuclear-powered submarines, three CG-47 class AEGIS cruisers, two LSD-41 class dock landing ships, one LHD-1 amphibious assault ship, four MSH-1 class minesweeper-hunters, and two TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

Approval of $53.5 million in long-lead funding for reactivation of the fourth battleship.

Reduction of $167 million for two of four requested MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships.

Approval of $411.5 million for procurement of 24 SH-60B LAMPS Mark III ASW helicopters, an addition of $41 million and 6 aircraft to the request.

Approval of $64.9 million for procurement of 6 LAMPS Mark I ASW helicoters, a reduction of $5 million.

Approval of multi-year procurement for MK-46 torpedoes.

Denial of multi-year procurement for P-3C ASW patrol aircraft.

Addition of $59.6 million for continued production of MK-60 CAPTOR mines.

Reduction of over $600 million in the Other Procurement, Navy account.

Approval of funds for continued multi-year procurement of KC-10A advanced tanker/cargo aircraft.

Approval of funds for continued multi-year procurement of C-5B cargo aircraft.

Addition of $150 million for 8 C-130H cargo aircraft for the Air National Guard.

Reduction of $981 million, 27 missiles and 15 sets of basing hardware associated with the Peacekeeper (MX) missile system.

Reduction of $75 million for procurement of a Trident submarine, to be offset by savings from prior year Trident II configured submarines.

Reduction of $75 million for procurement of modifications to B-52 bombers.

Reduction of $20 million for procurement related to the Trident I missile system.

Reduction of $35 million for procurement related to space launch support.

Approval of $582 million for advance procurement and long lead items associated with the Trident II missile system.

Approval of $670.2 million and 249 missiles for the Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missile program.

Approval of $5,461.8 million and 48 aircraft for final procurement associated with the B-1B bomber program.

Approval of $697.7 million and 43 reengining kits associated with the KC-135 tanker program.

Approval of $237 million for the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH-B) Radar.

Approval of $297.3 million and 2 aircraft associated with the E-6A upgrade to the TACAMO communications systems.

Approval of $83 million and 3 systems for procurement of the miniature homing vehicle anti-satellite (ASAT) Space Defense System.

Approval of $126.9 million associated with procurement of expendable launch vehicles.

Approval of $334.7 million for procurement of the final lot of Pershing II missiles.

Approval of $544.1 million and 95 missiles for procurement of ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCM).

Approval of $495 million in procurement related to the chemical deterrent program, including $163 million for equipment and munitions associated with modernization of our retaliatory capability.

Approval of $1,178.2 million for the procurement of 144 Apache attack helicopters.

Approval of $267.0 million for the procurement of 78 UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters on a multi-year contract.

Approval of $1,007.0 million for the procurement of 716 Bradley Fighting Vehicles.

Approval of $1,749.6 million for the procurement of 840 M-1 Abrams tanks, and a reduction $40.8 million in the amount requested for advanced procurement funds.

Approval of $150.0 million for the procurement of Sergeant York DIVAD guns, a reduction of $256.5 million from the administration's request.

Addition of $150.0 million for the procurement of equipment for the National Guard and Reserve components.

Approval of $202.6 million for the procurement of 6 A-6E Intruder aircraft.

Approval of $446.3 million for the procurement of 12 EA-6B electronic warfare aircraft.

Approval of $847.5 million for the procurement 43 AV-8B Harrier aircraft, 3 aircraft fewer than requested.

Approval of $553.6 million for the procurement of 15 F-14 Tomcat aircraft, 3 aircraft fewer than requested.

Approval of $2,493.7 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18 Hornet aircraft.

Reduction of $26.9 million requested for the procurement of 12 UC-12B/CX aircraft.

Reduction of $49.4 million for the procurement of 38 T-34C Mentor aircraft.

Approval of $115.7 million for the procurement of 12 F-16 Adversary aircraft.

Approval of $1,822.9 million for the procurement of 48 F-15 aircraft, a reduction of $80.0 million from the request.

Approval of $2,761.7 million for the procurement of 180 F-16 fighter aircraft, a reduction of $75.0 million from the request.

Approval of $94.0 million for the procurement of 3 HH-60 Nighthawk helicopters.

Approval of $241.5 million for the procurement of the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM), a reduction of $125.0 million from the request.

Approval of $53.7 million for the procurement of Low Level Laser Guided Bomb (LLLGB) kits, a reduction of $50.0 million from the request.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Reduction of over $480 million in the Navy RDT&E account.

Approval of funds for Navy RDT&E programs which support development of the SSN-21 nuclear-powered attack submarine.

Reduction of $54 million for the Navy's New Threat Upgrade program.

Reduction of $25.8 million for the Navy Seafire electro-optic sensor program.

Reduction of $15.380 million for the Navy's Rapidly Deployable Surveillance System (RDSS).

Approval of $413.681 million for continued development of the C-17 airlifter aircraft, a reduction of $40 million.

Reduction of $300 million in research associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative program.

Reduction of $10 million in research associated with the strategic computing project in DARPA's Strategic Technology program.

Reduction of $14.002 million for Navy space technology research and development.

Reduction of $15 million for research and development associated with Trident I configured SSBNs.

Reduction of $10 million for Navy research and development associated with the Defense Meterological Satellite Program (DMSP).

Reduction of $25 million for research and development associated with the very high speed integrated circuit (VHSIC) program.

Reduction of $15 million for research and development of the SRAM II program.

Reduction of $15 million for hard silo research and development under the ICBM modernization program.

Reduction of $10 million for space shuttle related activities at the Consolidated Space Operations Center.

Approval of $784.1 million for Peacekeeper (MX), $515.4 million for small ICBM, and $109.1 million for mobile launcher research and development.

Approval of $173.9 million for the Advanced Strategic Missile System research and development program.

Approval of $2,165.6 million for research and development of the Trident II missile system.

Approval of $68.8 million for research and development associated with the Tomahawk cruise missile program.

Approval of $367.4 million for B-1B bomber research and development.

Approval of the full amount requested for research and development associated with the Advanced Technology Bomber and the Advanced Cruise Missile.

Approval of $67.5 million for research and development associated with the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH-B) radar.

Approval of $97.2 million for the Minimum Essential Emergency Communications System (MEECN), including $24.1 million for the Ground Wave Emergency Network (GWEN).

Approval of $86.3 million for research and development of the E-6A TACAMO replacement aircraft.

Approval of $346 million for research and development of the MILSTAR satellite and $132 million for Air Force user terminals.

Approval of $28.5 million for submarine laser communications research.

Approval of $221.4 million for research and development associated with space boosters, including $201.6 million for expendable launch vehicles.

Approval of $79.2 million for research and development associated with space launch support.

Reduction of $20.0 million from the Army's request for the development of the LHX.

Reduction of $37.0 million from the Army's request to equip the Sergeant York DIVAD gun with Stinger air defense missiles.

Reduction of $40.0 million from the administration's request for the development of the JTACMS-A.

Approval of $603.7 million for the development of the tilt-rotor JVX (MV-22A Osprey).

Approval of $237.9 million for the development of Navy A-6E improvements.

Approval of $348.0 million for the development of F-14D enhancements.

Approval of $202.8 million for the development of the Air Force's Advanced Tactical Fighter, a reduction of $40.0 million from the request.

Approval of $40.8 million to complete the development of the LANTIRN system.

Approval of $210.2 million for the development of the Air Force's stand-off targeting system, JSTARS, a reduction of $50.0 million from the request.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Approval of $81.3 billion for operation and maintenance in fiscal year 1986, a reduction of $1.1 billion from the administration request. The committee estimates that the recommended level of authorization will provide for approximately 3.9 percent growth over the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1985.

MANPOWER

Reduction of 10,730 active duty personnel from the total requested end strength of 2,178,100.

Approval of a 3 percent increase in basic pay, basic allowance for quarters, and basic allowance for subsistence for all uniformed service personnel, effective on January 1, 1986.

Approval of enhancement of temporary lodging allowances, household goods weight allowances, certain mileage allowances, and family separation allowances.

Approval of a total authorized average strength for the Selected Reserve of 1,096,134, an increase of more than 30,000 above the authorized average strength for fiscal year 1985.

Approval of a total end strength for civilian personnel of 1,087,776, the level at which the Department is expected to be manned at the end of fiscal year 1985.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT INPROVEMENTS

Encourages consolidation of technology base and advanced technology development projects to enable broader oversight of research priorities.

Promotes continuous competition throughout the period of time in which a system is acquired, when such competition is cost-effective, would not result in unacceptable delay, and is otherwise in the national security interests of the United States.

Requires the Secretary of Defense to make thorough estimates of what it should cost to manufacture a particular system.

Ensures that the military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who have substantial responsibility for the acquisition of systems are highly qualified.

Ensures that the career path for military officers who have specialized in the acquisition of systems offers sufficient opportunity for advancement and promotion.

Provides mandatory training for personnel responsible for enforcing quality assurance in the manufacture of systems.

Promotes increased disclosure of the activities of employees of defense contractors who are former employees of the Department of Defense who were previously involved with the acquisition of systems while employed by the Department of Defense.

Prevents conflicts of interest by employees of the Department of Defense involved in the negotiation and administration of government contracts.

Continues procurement technical assistance through outreach programs.

Shifts the burden of proof in certain matters in government contract dispute resolution.

SUMMARY OF NOTIFICATIONS, REPORTS OR STUDIES REQUESTED

1. A report from the Department of the Air Force on small ICBM missile and mobility tradeoffs prior to initiation of full scale development and not later than September 1, 1985.
2. A report from the Department of Defense on an independent review of small missile and basing options by the Defense Science Board prior to submission of the fiscal year 1987 budget request.
3. A study by the Department of Defense to update analysis of the future strategic bomber force, including requirements, relative cost and relative effectiveness of alternative delivery platforms by December 1, 1985.
4. A study by the Department of the Air Force comparing the cost, performance and availability of the SRAM II configuration with an "austere" version of the SRAM by February 1, 1986.
5. A report from the President in both classified and unclassified forms that updates arms control compliance issues as well as fur-

ther findings regarding Soviet non-compliance with their Treaty obligations by December 1, 1985 and each year thereafter.

6. A report by the Department of Defense that addresses the military implications of Soviet treaty violations and details possible policy and programmatic responses, by July 15, 1985.

7. A requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a final report on procedures required to permit allied or friendly nations to build diesel-electric submarines in United States shipyards, as requested last year, before fiscal year 1986 funds for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy may be obligated or expended.

8. A report from the Secretary of Defense on alternative plans for procuring SH-60B (LAMPS MK-III) aircraft, due February 5, 1986.

9. A letter from the Secretary of Defense stating that responsibility for waterfront security has been transferred from the Air Force to the Navy.

10. A letter from the Secretary of Navy explaining the rationale for not including funds in the fiscal year 1987 budget for second-sourcing the MK-48 ADCAP torpedo, due February 15, 1986 unless such funds are included.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy stating his plans for the Anti-Submarine Warfare Stand-Off Weapon (ASW SOW) program.

12. A letter from the Secretary of Air Force due prior to applying an undistributed reduction in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force against the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program.

13. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the feasibility of establishing a multi-year procurement program for C-130 aircraft.

14. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the status of and plans for the C-131 fleet.

15. A report detailing the projected development and procurement costs of the LHX, and an evaluation of alternative aircraft which might meet LHX requirements.

16. A report on the feasibility and cost of modifying F-16 aircraft to carry the AIM-7 Sparrow missile.

17. A report addressing the restructuring of the Aquila program to provide for a basic air vehicle with a variety of mission payloads, and the proposed development of a family of RPVs.

18. A report describing modifications necessary to the Mobile Subscriber Equipment (MSE) and any planned upgrades subsequent to initial procurement.

19. A certification from the Secretary of Defense following DIVAD follow-on testing (FOT) prior to obligating fiscal year 1986 funds for the procurement of DIVAD.

20. A report on the feasibility and savings which might be achieved from establishing second source manufacturers for various M-1 and Bradley Fighting Vehicle subsystems.

21. A report assessing the potential savings from the establishment of a second source manufacturer for the TOW missile.

22. A report justifying the decision to proceed with the procurement of the Unit Level Circuit Switch (ULCS).

23. Certification by the Secretary of Defense that on the basis of the producability and alternative studies, production of the AMRAAM missile is warranted.

24. An analysis of threat-based munitions and a master plan establishing an overall Department of Defense acquisition strategy for those weapons.

25. A report from the Chief of each Guard and Reserve component detailing the items purchased with the additional $150.0 million provided to redress equipment shortfalls.

26. A report from the Secretary of the Army on the reasons for proceeding with the Bushmaster gun on a sole source basis if the Army chooses that approach for follow-on acquisition.

27. A report from the Secretary of Defense within 60 days after the beginning of fiscal year 1986, which contains a plan for the establishment and operation of a pilot exchange program during fiscal year 1986 for the nuclear risk reduction military exchange program between the Soviet Union and United States.

28. A report by the Secretary of Defense, due within 60 days after enactment of the Act, on the manner the authorized civilian end strength of the Department of Defense was allocated among the military departments and defense agencies.

29. A notification by the Secretary of Defense if he determines that it is necessary in the interests of national defense to authorize the employment of an additional number of civilian personnel in excess of the authorized number, but not exceeding 2 percent of that authorized number.

30. A report by the Department of Defense Inspector General on whether laws and regulations pertaining to importation of weapons as war souvenirs were applied properly with respect to individuals returning from operations in Grenada.

31. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the steps required to implement a two year budget for the Department of Defense.

32. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the desirability of continuing to permit defense contractors to earn profit on general and administrative expenses in defense contracts.

33. A report from the Secretary of Defense on the status of the C-131 modification program.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Background on Procurement Authorization

In 1959, section 338, title 10, United States Code, was amended by enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Over the years, the law has been amended to require annual authorization of additional items such as tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes and related support equipment, various other weapons, support equipment, and other procurement items.

The committee and its various subcommittees held extensive hearings on the Department of Defense fiscal year 1986 request and related matters. Based on supporting testimony and other information provided to the committee, an exhaustive review of the many procurement programs and related requirements has been made. The committee's recommendations appear in subsequent pages of this report.

Summary of Recommended Funding Changes

The table below shows comparisons of the amounts appropriated for procurement for fiscal year 1985 with amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986 and those recommended by the committee.

Summary of Adjustments to Fiscal Year 1986 Procurement Authorization Request

[Dollar amounts in millions; totals may not add due to rounding]

	Fiscal year 1985 budget authority	Fiscal year 1986 Request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
Army	$19,376.5	$21,366.1	−$615.8	$20,750.3
Navy/Marine Corps	34,056.6	37,430.1	−1,847.1	35,583.0
Air Force	41,814.5	46,566.2	−2,358.7	44,207.5
Defense Agencies	1,169.3	1,391.9	−1.1	1,390.8
Guard and Reserve	380.0	0	312.0	312.0
Total	96,796.9	106,754.3	−4,510.7	102,243.6

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	ROTARY						
4	EH-60A HELICOPTER (QUICKFIX) (MYP)	18	146.4		-32.0		114.4
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-27.8				-27.8
	NET		118.6		-32.0		86.6
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24.4				24.4
6	AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE)	144	1269.2			144	1269.2
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-91.0				-91.0
	NET		1178.2				1178.2
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55.3				55.3
8	UH-60A (BLACK HAWK) (MYP)	78	414.7			78	414.7
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-147.7				-147.7
	NET		267.0				267.0
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		199.0				199.0
	SUBTOTAL, AIRCRAFT		1842.5		-32.0		1810.5
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
11	OV-1 SURVEILLANCE AIRPLANE (MOHAWK)		27.7				27.7
12	RC-12D RECON AIRPLANE		0.5				0.5
13	RV-1 RECON AIRPLANE		0.5				0.5
15	AH1S ATTACK HELICOPTER (COBRA-TOW)		124.5		-20.0		104.5
17	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER (MYP)		413.2		-12.0		401.2
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-159.9				-159.9
	NET		253.3		-12.0		241.3
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		124.8				124.8
19	CH-54 CARGO HELICOPTER (TARHE)		0.5				0.5
23	UH-1 UTILITY HELICOPTER (IROQUOIS)		12.2				12.2
24	UH-60A (BLACK HAWK) MODS		15.4				15.4
25	ARMY HELICOPTER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (AHIP)		206.0				206.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-47.2				-47.2
	NET		158.8				158.8
26	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		51.8				51.8
29	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		1.0				1.0
30	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $900,000 (AIRCRAFT)		0.1				0.1
31	ACFT 9WW		17.0				17.0
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		788.1		-32.0		756.1

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
32	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		949.7		-100.0		849.7
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
33	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		67.8				67.8
34	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		35.0				35.0
35	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		9.4				9.4
36	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT TRAINING SYSTEMS	7	131.6			7	131.6
37	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		61.9				61.9
39	WAR CONSUMABLES		6.5				6.5
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		312.2		0.0		312.2
	PRIOR YEAR AUTHORIZATION TRANSFER		---		44.0		44.0
	TOTAL, ARMY AIRCRAFT		3892.5		-120.0		3772.5

EH–60 QUICK FIX II

The administration requested $118.6 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft and $24.4 million in advance procurement for 18 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The EH-60 Quick Fix II is an ECM/ESM (Electronic Countermeasures/Electromagnetic Support Measures) system intended to provide tactical signal intelligence and electronic warfare support to Army units. The EH-60A Quick Fix II, will replace the EH-1X and EH-1H Quick Fix systems based in Europe. Quick Fix II will provide division level forces with their primary source of airborne electronic countermeasures, intercept, and radio direction finding.

The EH-60A mission electronics are configured in a standard UH-60A Blackhawk helicopter which are purchased on a firm fixed-price basis as part of the Blackhawk multi-year contract.

As a result of the success of the Blackhawk multi-year contract and favorable negotiations of the EH-60 contract, the Army has identified a savings of $32.0 million available in the fiscal year 1985 appropriation for the EH-60A program. The committee therefore recommends that $32.0 million available from the 1985 program be brought forward and that $32.0 million be reduced from the amount requested in fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends an authorization of $86.6 million for the procurement of 18 EH-60A aircraft in 1985 and $24.4 million in advanced procurement for 18 aircraft in 1987.

AH–64 APACHE ATTACK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $1,178.2 million for the procurement of 144 AH-64 Apache helicopters in fiscal year 1986 and $55.3 million in advance procurement for 144 helicopters in fiscal year 1987.

The AH-64 is a highly mobile attack helicopter intended to be the Army's primary, quick, reacting, airborne anti-tank weapon. Armed with Hellfire missiles, 2.75 inch rockets, a 30mm cannon and a very sophisticated mission equipment package, the Apache is capable of operating at night and in adverse weather with unprecedented effectiveness and survivability.

In 1984, the Army increased the inventory objective for the Apache from 515 to 675 helicopters. In the committee report (S. 98-500) accompanying the fiscal year 1985 Senate Defense Authorization bill, the committee reserved judgment on the proposed increase. That decision must now be made since advanced procurement funds will be required in fiscal year 1986 to procure the additional aircraft. Although the manufacturer is presently encountering difficulties reaching the approved production rate of 144 aircraft per year, the committee nevertheless believes that such additional procurement is warranted.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of AH-64 Apache helicopters.

UH-60 BLACKHAWK HELICOPTER

The administration requested $267.0 million for the procurement of 78 UH-60 helicopters in fiscal year 1986 and $199.0 million in advance procurement for 78 helicopters in fiscal year 1987.

The UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter is the Army's squad-carrying helicopter designed to lift an infantry squad of 11 combat-equipped soldiers in tactical assaults and related combat support missions.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of UH-60A Blackhawk helicopters.

AH-1 COBRA MODS

The administration requested $124.5 million for modifications to the AH-1 Cobra fleet. A portion of these funds will be spent to modify AH-1G aircraft to the AH-1G (MOD) configuration. According to the Army, sufficient funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1985 which, when combined with fiscal year 1986 funds, will complete the AH-1G to G (MOD) modification with a savings of $20.0 million from the fiscal year 1986 request.

The committee therefore recommends authorization of $104.5 million for AH-1 Cobra modifications.

ARMY AIRCRAFT SPARES

The administration requested $949.7 million for the procurement of spares and repair parts for Army aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The committee notes that as a result of delays in the obligation rate of funds authorized and appropriated in prior years, unexpended funds remain available for the procurement of spare parts. The committee therefore recommends an undistributed reduction of $100.0 million from the administration's request for aircraft spare parts in fiscal year 1986. The committee recommends an authorization of $849.7 million for the procurement of Army Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts in fiscal year 1986.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEMS						
1	CHAPARRAL	300	110.4			300	110.4
2	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		5.0				5.0
3	PATRIOT	585	983.4			585	983.4
4	STINGER	3439	304.1			3439	304.1
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
5	LASER HELLFIRE SYSTEM	6576	250.7			6576	250.7
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
6	TOW 2	20100	226.9			20100	226.9
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22.0				22.0
8	PERSHING		[ ]				[ ]
9	MULTIPLE LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (MYP)	72000	579.5			72000	579.5
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-71.7				-71.7
	NET		507.8				507.8
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		41.0				41.0
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		2786.0		0.0		2786.0
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
12	PATRIOT		17.2				17.2
13	CHAPARRAL		112.9				112.9
14	HAWK		54.1				54.1
15	TOW		37.8				37.8
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		222.0		0.0		222.0
21	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		322.0		-5.0		317.0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
22	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		21.0				21.0
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (MISSILES)		3.8				3.8
24	PRODUCTION BASE SPT		29.9				29.9
25	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		2.0				2.0
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		56.7		0.0		56.7
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		3386.7		-5.0		3381.7

PATRIOT

The administration requested $983.4 million for the procurement of 585 missiles and 12 Patriot fire units. The Patriot is an all-altitude air defense missile designed to replace the Nike Hercules and Hawk air defense systems. The first operational Patriot battalion was deployed to Europe in early 1985.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of Patriot air defense systems.

HELLFIRE MISSILE

The administration requested $250.7 million for the procurement of 6,576 Hellfire missiles in fiscal year 1986.

The Hellfire is a helicopter fired, laser guided missile intended for deployment as the primary anti-armor weapon system on the Army's AH-64 Apache helicopter.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of Hellfire missiles.

TOW MISSILE

The administration requested $226.9 million for the procurement of 20,100 TOW (Tube-launched Optically-tracked, Wire-guided) anti-tank missiles. The TOW missile is an anti-tank/assault guided missile procured by both the Army and Marine Corps.

According to the fiscal year 1986 budget justification documents, the Army intends to procure a total of 131,783 TOW missiles. Of this total procurement objective, 77,100 missiles remain to be procured in 1986 and subsequent years.

The TOW missile is currently being produced by a sole source manufacturer. The committee believes that with such substantial additional quantities yet to be procured, considerable savings may be available through the development of an alternative source.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services not later than December 1, 1985 assessing the potential savings from the establishment of a second source for the TOW missile. Should the Army choose to continue with a sole source producer in fiscal year 1987, rather than developing an alternative source, the committee will require a compelling justification to support such a decision.

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of TOW missiles.

PERSHING II

The administration requested $334.7 million for the procurement of Pershing II missiles in fiscal year 1986. As a result of revisions in the total procurement requirement, this marks the final procurement lot of Pershing II missiles.

The Pershing II is a two stage, solid propellant, intermediate-range ballistic missile with significant improvements in range and accuracy over the Pershing Ia system that it is replacing on a one-for-one basis. The Pershing II is a major element of NATO's theater nuclear force modernization program announced in December

1979. The committee commends our NATO allies for their resolve in proceeding with this modernization, and regards this resolve as an important factor in inducing the Soviet Union to return to the negotiating table in Geneva.

The committee continues to support NATO's theater nuclear force modernization program, and therefore recommends full funding of the Pershing II program in fiscal year 1986.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	CARRIER, COMMAND POST LIGHT, FT, M577A2	115	23.6			115	23.6
2	CARRIER, PERSONNEL, FT, ARM, M113A2	325	82.9			325	82.9
3	BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLES (MYP)	716	1024.6			716	1024.6
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-17.6				-17.6
	NET		1007.0				1007.0
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		27.6				27.6
5	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES		79.4				79.4
6	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMO SUPPORT VEHICLE	197	101.5		-12.9	197	88.6
8	RECOVERY VEHICLE, MED, FT, M88A1	240	215.8			240	215.8
9	ABRAMS TANK SERIES ROLL (MYP)	840	2063.2			840	2063.2
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-313.6				-313.6
	NET		1749.6				1749.6
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	(840)	359.2	(-120)	-40.8	(720)	318.4
11	M60 SERIES TANK TRAINING DEVICES		20.4				20.4
12	M1 SERIES TANK TRAINING DEVICES		65.6				65.6
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
13	CARRIER, MOD		56.2				56.2
15	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		80.8				80.8
16	BFVS SERIES (MOD)		19.0				19.0
17	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109 SER (MOD)		25.4				25.4
19	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)		20.4				20.4
20	TANK, COMBAT, FT, 105MM GUN, M60SER (MOD) (MYP)		130.6		-30.0		100.6
22	105MM TANK GUN (MOD)		6.0				6.0
23	TANK, M1 SERIES (MOD)		70.1				70.1
24	ROBOTIC OBST BREACHING ASSAULT TANK (MOD)		17.8		-17.8		0.0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
25	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		649.0		-20.0		629.0
26	VALUE ENGINEERING		1.0				1.0
27	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (TCV-WTCV)		0.8				0.8
28	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		95.8				95.8
	SUBTOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		4905.5		-121.5		4784.0
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
30	SERGEANT YORK DIVAD GUN	117	506.5		-256.5		250.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-100.0				-100.0
	NET		406.5		-256.5		150.0
31	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		11.0				11.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
33	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240	4924	27.1			4924	27.1
34	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (SAW) 5.56MM	6000	14.5			6000	14.5
35	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	821	9.0			821	9.0
36	LAUNCHER, SMOKE GRENADE	3177	2.1			3177	2.1
37	MORTAR, 81MM, XM252	187	6.1			187	6.1
38	MORTAR, 120 MM	63	5.0			63	5.0
39	M16 RIFLE	71990	39.3			71990	39.3
40	PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON, 9MM	25400	7.5	-25400	-7.5	0	0.0
41	VEH RAPID FIRE WPN SYS-BUSHMASTER (MYP)	715	45.6			715	45.6
42	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8.3				8.3
43	TANK MUZZLE BORESIGHT DEVICE	2327	4.6			2327	4.6
	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
44	DIVAD (MODS)		0.5		-0.5		0.0
45	HOWITZER, 155MM, M114A2 (MOD)		1.7				1.7
46	M16A1 RIFLE MODS		3.3				3.3
48	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $900,000 (WOCV-WTCV)		0.8				0.8
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
49	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		183.6				183.6
50	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (WOCV-WTCV)		2.9				2.9
51	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		51.4				51.4
53	5.56 CARBINE XM4	4685	2.8			4685	2.8
	SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		833.6		-264.5		569.1
	TOTAL, ARMY WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		5739.1		-386.0		5353.1

BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE

The administration requested $1,007.0 million for the procurement of 716 Bradley Fighting Vehicles in fiscal year 1986, and $27.6 million in advance procurement for 870 vehicles in 1987.

The Bradley Fighting Vehicles include the Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV) and the Cavalry Fighting Vehicle (CFV). The IFV/CFV will provide mechanized infantry and scouts of armored cavalry the necessary mobility, fire power, and survivability to operate on the modern battlefield and to accomplish reconnaissance and security missions. The mission of the IFV is to provide cross-country mobility and vehicular mounted fire power to support mechanized infantry operations in mounted and dismounted combat.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of Bradley Fighting Vehicles.

FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEHICLE (FAASV)

The administration requested $101.5 million for the procurement of 197 Field Artillery Ammunition Support Vehicles (FAASV). The FAASV (M-992) is a tracked, armored vehicle designed to transport and resupply ammunition to field artillery units.

As a result of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $12.9 million, for a total of $88.6 million. The committee has not adjusted the quantity of vehicles authorized, and encourages the Army to procure as many vehicles as possible with the funds provided.

M-1 ABRAMS MAIN BATTLE TANK

The administration requested $1,749.6 million for the procurement of 840 M-1 Abrams Main Battle Tanks in 1986, and $359.2 million for the procurement of 840 tanks in 1987.

The committee recommends an authorization of $1,749.6 million for the procurement of 840 M-1 tanks in 1986, and $318.4 million in advance procurement for 720 tanks in 1987. This reduction of 120 tanks and $40.8 million in advance procurement is strictly the result of congressionally mandated budget reductions.

M-1/BFV SUBSYSTEMS

The committee is concerned over the cost and deliveries of a number of the subsystems of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and M-1 Abrams Tank. It is believed that cost reductions on subsystems of both vehicles could be achieved if second sources were developed.

For example, in the case of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, the Integrated Sight Unit (ISU) may be a candidate for second sourcing. With the number of vehicles yet to be procured, and those scheduled to be retrofitted, the savings could be substantial. Additional savings could be realized on the M-1 Abrams Tank if the laser rangefinder and thermal imaging system were competed with a second source manufacturer.

Accordingly, the Army is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services on the feasibility and savings possible on these and other potential second source candidates. This report shall be submitted by January 31, 1986.

SERGEANT YORK DIVISION AIR DEFENSE GUN (DIVAD)

The administration requested $406.5 million for the procurement of 117 Sergeant York Division Air Defense (DIVAD) guns and $11 million for advance procurement of 117 DIVAD guns in fiscal year 1987.

The DIVAD is a short range, fast reaction air defense system consisting of twin 40mm guns, acquisition and search radars mounted on a refurbished M48A5 tank chassis. The DIVAD is intended for deployment in the air defense artillery battalions of armored and mechanized divisions, the Corps air defense artillery group, and armored calvary units.

The development of the DIVAD was initiated in 1977 to redress a serious shortfall in the Army's air defense inventory. Currently, the only air defense gun assigned to active Army units is the 20mm Vulcan air defense system. The Vulcan is a system with limited capabilities and cannot provide adequate air defense to ground units on the modern battlefield. Therefore, the committee remains strongly supportive of the requirement to develop a more capable air defense gun.

In recognition of the deficiencies in the Army air defense inventory, the Department of Defense and Congress agreed to an accelerated nd highly concurrent development program for the DIVAD. Under the original schedule, 273 fire units (more than 40 percent of the entire program) would be authorized before the first production units would be delivered to the Army. Under such a schedule, Congress would not have available production vehicle test results when being asked to approve substantial sums for production. In light of the very compelling operational requirement, the risk of proceeding without that information was deemed acceptable.

Test results thus far have shown the DIVAD to be deficient in certain key areas. Problems with the radar, such as false targets and multipath problems, and system reliability (particularly of the power and actuation system) have been among the more persistent discrepancies. The committee notes that while no single deficiency would appear to justify terminating the program, the aggregate of all identified deficiencies justifies a cautious approach toward the commitment of additional procurement funds.

Furthermore, certain deficiencies, such as the system's susceptibility to electronic countermeasures (ECM), will require the expenditure of additional development funds. Increased development funds have also been requested to equip the DIVAD with Stinger air defense missiles. While recognizing that such a modification would substantially increase the effectiveness of DIVAD, the committee believes that decision should be deferred until the future of the program is more clearly determined.

In view of the uncertainties of the requirement for additional development expenditures, and pending the outcome of Follow-On Testing (FOT) scheduled for the spring of 1985, the committee has recommended statutory language prohibiting the expenditure of funds to procure DIVAD systems until after the test results are known. This provision would require that before any additional funds are obligated for DIVAD production, the Secretary of Defense must certify to the Congress that the FOT results justify continuing the program.

The committee understands that the contractor remains fully responsible for meeting the performance requirements specified for DIVAD under the existing "correction of deficiencies" provision, regardless of the outcome of the Follow-on Test and the subsequent decision by the Secretary of Defense to continue or terminate the program.

The committee recommends an authorization of $150 million in fiscal year 1986 and $11.0 million in advance procurement for 1987. Furthermore, if the results of FOT are judged successful, the administration is encouraged to submit a request for supplemental authorization/appropriation for the procurement of DIVAD.

The committee intends to schedule hearings on the results of the Follow-on Test and the Secretary's recommendations. The committee reserves judgment until that time as to the scope and pace of the entire DIVAD program. The committee will recommend termination of the program if the results of the test this summer are unsatisfactory.

PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON (9MM)

The administration requested a total $10.6 million for the handgun ($7.5 million in this section of the budget) and the ammunition ($1.4 million in another section of the budget).

The committee, as in the past, continues to believe that this is not a high priority defense requirement. The committee, therefore, recommends the deletion of all funds requested for the 9mm handgun and ammunition programs for fiscal year 1986 for all services.

25MM BUSHMASTER CANNON

In fiscal year 1985 the Army executed the third and final option of the fiscal year 1983 contract for 851 cannons produced by Hughes Helicopters, Inc. The cannons are used on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle System.

The Congress disapproved the Army's request in the fiscal year 1985 budget for advance procurement of additional cannons and denied a multi-year approach.

It is the committee's understanding that the Army intends to proceed with a sole source contract for an additional 5 years for the cannon with the current manufacturer.

This approach is unacceptable in that it fails to comply with the clear direction provided last year by the Congress on competitive acquisition. Before the Army obligates any funds to procure 25 mm cannons, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the committee with the justification of its acquisition strategy, including a certification that the strategy is consistent with the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AMMUNITION						
	ATOMIC MATERIEL						
1	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT MATERIEL		5.2				5.2
	CONTROLLED ITEMS						
4	CTG, 5.56MM, BALL M193	114883	18.1			114883	18.1
5	CTG, 5.56MM, BLANK M200	84807	12.0			84807	12.0
6	CTG, 5.56MM, BLK M200, LKD F/SAW	8637	2.2			8637	2.2
7	CTG, 5.56MM, 4 BALL M855/1 TRCR M856 LKD	26884	9.6			26884	9.6
8	CTG, 5.56MM, BALL M16-A2	96289	25.0			96289	25.0
9	CTG, 5.56MM, TRACER M16-A2	21456	6.5			21456	6.5
10	CTG, 7.62MM, TRACER M62 LKD	1439	0.5			1439	0.5
12	CTG, 7.62MM, 4 BALL M80/1 TRCR M62 LKD	84525	25.0			84525	25.0
13	CTG, 7.62MM, BALL M80 LKD/M13	2428	0.7			2428	0.7
14	CTG, 7.62MM, LKD 4 BALL ITRACER OHF	4007	1.4			4007	1.4
16	CTG, 7.62MM, SPEC BALL M118	6433	1.9			6433	1.9
17	CTG, CAL .22, BALL LR	136179	2.7			136179	2.7
18	CTG, 9MM, BALL	8312	1.4	-8312	-1.4	0	0.0
19	CTG, CAL .45, BALL M1911	18759	2.2			18759	2.2
20	CTG, CAL .45, MATCH GRADE	5120	0.8			5120	0.8
22	CTG, CAL .50, LKD 4 BALL/1 TRCR W/M15A2L	6560	9.6			6560	9.6
23	CTG, CAL .50, APIT, M20 LKD	834	1.4			834	1.4
24	CTG, CAL .50, BALL LKD	2160	2.4			2160	2.4
25	CTG, CAL .50, BLK, M1A1, LKD W/M9LK F/M2	19582	15.0			19582	15.0
27	CTG, CAL .50, LKD TRACER M17	2882	4.1			2882	4.1
28	CTG, CAL .50, LKD 4 BALL/1 TRACER W/M9 L	33124	44.4			33124	44.4
29	CTG, 20MM, LKD TP-T M220 SERIES MLB M14A	5175	19.3			5175	19.3
31	CTG, 25MM, HEI-T M792 W/F	648	18.9			648	18.9
32	CTG, 25MM, APDS-T M791 W/M28(MYP)	455	11.1			455	11.1
33	CTG, 25MM, TPT LKD M793 MLB M28	2400	37.7			2400	37.7
35	CTG, 30MM, LKD HEDP M789 W/FUZE(MYP)	881	26.0			881	26.0
36	CTG, 30MM, LKD TP M788(MYP)	369	3.8			369	3.8
38	CTG, 40MM, TP-T M813 F/SGT YORK(MYP)	144	11.3	-144	-11.3	0	0.0
40	CTG, 40MM, HE W/PROX M822	144	31.0	-144	-31.0	0	0.0
41	CTG, 40MM, HEDP M430	2047	48.8			2047	48.8
42	CTG, 40MM, TP F/MK19	485	4.8			485	4.8
43	CTG, 40MM, PRAC M781	2478	6.0			2478	6.0
44	CTG, 75MM, BLANK, M337A1 F/HOWITZER	174	2.8			174	2.8
46	CTG, 81MM, ILLUM IUK XM853	103	15.7			103	15.7
47	CTG, 81MM, HE IUK W/FUZE	170	31.7			170	31.7
48	CTG, 81MM, SMK RP IUK XM819	66	12.4			66	12.4
49	CTG, 81MM, IMP 1/10 RANGE TNG XM880	36	2.4			36	2.4
51	CTG, SUB CAL .22, PRACT CHG=2 M745	157	1.1			157	1.1
55	CTG, 4.2-INCH, ILLUM, W/FUZE	143	27.3			143	27.3
56	CTG, 4.2-INCH, SMOKE, WP	51	6.7			51	6.7
57	CTG, 120MM, HE W/MULTI-OPTION FUZE	83	30.3			83	30.3
58	CTG, 120MM, ILLUM	8	4.0			8	4.0
59	CTG, 120MM, SMOKE	41	11.2			41	11.2

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
61	CTG, 105MM, HEAT MP T M456A2	130	47.2			130	47.2
62	CTG, 105MM, TP-T, M490	347	51.2			347	51.2
63	CTG, 105MM, TRACE-P FOR M833		2.3				2.3
64	CTG, 105MM, DS-TP M724	433	89.4			433	89.4
65	CTG, 105MM, APFSDS-T M833	76	46.8			76	46.8
67	CTG, 120MM, APFSDS-T XM829	45	59.7			45	59.7
68	CTG, 120MM, HEAT-MP-T, M830(MYP)	13	27.3			13	27.3
69	CTG, 120MM, TP-T XM831(MYP)	31	29.6			31	29.6
70	CTG, 120MM, TPCSDS-T, M865(MYP)	49	29.7			49	29.7
71	PROJ, 155MM, HE, ICM M483 (MYP)	689	295.8			689	299.8
73	PROJ, 155MM, SMK, WP, M825	38	16.3			38	16.3
76	PROJ, 155MM, HE, ADAM M731 (MYP)	6	26.5			6	26.5
78	PROJ, 155MM, HE, RAAMS M741 (MYP)	41	71.6			41	71.6
80	PROJ, 155MM, HE, COPPERHEAD (EA)	6900	235.0			6900	235.0
81	PROJ, 155MM, CHEM GB-2		[ ]				[ ]
82	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 155MM, GREEN BAG M3	466	27.7			466	27.7
83	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 155MM, WHITE BAG M4	378	30.4			378	30.4
84	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 155MM, RED BAG M203	60	20.4			60	20.4
85	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 155MM, WHITE BAG M11	140	17.8			140	17.8
89	CHARGE, PROPELLING, 8-INCH WB, M188	129	29.2			129	29.2
92	FUZE, MTSQ M577/M577A1	758	49.3			758	49.3
93	FUZE, MTSQ M582/M582A1	154	10.5			154	10.5
94	PRIMER, PERC, M82	1491	2.9			1491	2.9
95	GROUND IMP MINE SCAT SYS AP M74 (MYP)	36	14.5			36	14.5
96	GROUND IMP MINE SCAT SYS AT M75 (MYP)	134	26.5			134	26.5
97	CANISTER MINE PRACTICE XM88 (VOLCANO)	5	1.5			5	1.5
98	CANISTER MINE (VOLCANO) XM87	10	2.6			10	2.6
99	MINE, AT, BLU-91/B (VOLCANO) (MYP)	60	12.6			60	12.6
100	MINE, AP, BLU-92/B (VOLCANO) (MYP)	12	5.0			12	5.0
101	MTR RKT 5 IN MK22 MOD 4 (EA)	1412	5.4			1412	5.4
102	LINE CHARGE M58A3 (MICLIC) (EA)	1018	12.3			1018	12.3
103	LINE CHARGE INERT M68A2 (MICLIC) (EA)	103	1.2			103	1.2
104	MODULAR PACK MINE SYSTEM	3358	36.0			3358	36.0
106	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS & OTHER		16.5				16.5
107	DEMO KIT BANGALORE TORPEDO	6	3.0			6	3.0
108	LIGHTWEIGHT MULTI-PURPOSE SYSTEM	156	107.6			156	107.6
109	LIGHTWEIGHT MULTI PURPOSE SYSTEM TRNR	1645	3.1			1645	3.1
110	HYDRA 70 RKT, MPSM HE M261 WHD(MYP)	36	28.9			36	28.9
111	HYDRA 70 RKT, MPSM PRAC M267 WHD	8	5.4			8	5.4
112	GRENADE, HAND, ALL TYPES		33.0				33.0
113	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		33.5				33.5
114	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		28.7				28.7
	MISCELLANEOUS						
115	AMMO COMPONENTS/SUPPORT, ALL TYPES		21.3				21.3
116	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (MISC-AMMO)		3.7				3.7
117	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1.0				1.0
118	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		5.2				5.2
119	NITROGUANIDINE (LB)		25.0				25.0
120	COMP A-5		9.1				9.1
121	COMP C-4		9.0				9.0
122	COMP B		4.4				4.4
123	PBX 0280		1.6				1.6
124	CYCLOTOL 70/30		2.8				2.8

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
126	COMP LX-14		5.8				5.8
130	AMMO 9MM/ELT		1.7				1.7
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION		2266.6		-43.7		2222.9
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
131	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		280.6				280.6
132	COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT		14.0				14.0
133	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		22.5				22.5
134	JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND MODERNIZATION		2.0				2.0
135	CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM		49.3				49.3
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION PROD BASE SUPPORT		368.4		0.0		368.4
	TOTAL, ARMY AMMUNITION		2635.0		-43.7		2591.3

The administration requested $2,635.0 million for procurement of ammunition in support of the Army's training and war reserve requirements. The committee recommends $2591.3 million. This represents a $43.7 million reduction in the request.

The committee remains concerned that the ammunition program has been continually underfunded and that current trends in ammunition procurement and ammunition production base support provide an insufficient base from which to achieve training, war reserve and production capacity objectives. In this regard, the committee plans to hold an extensive review of ammunition production base, production efficiencies, modernization of facilities, and delivery and storage. The RDX/HMX production facilities, the combined effects munitions (CEM) program, and benefits of selected use of second sourcing are among the topics which will be addressed.

Unless otherwise noted the reductions were made without prejudice in response to budget constraints in all areas and services.

DIVAD GUN

The administration requested a total of $42.3 million for ammunition for the DIVAD gun. With the ongoing uncertainty over the procurement of the weapon system itself, the committee deleted all funds from the ammunition account. If the weapon is procured, procurement of ammunition will be reconsidered.

BINARY CHEMICAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

The administration requested a total of $1,275.0 million for the United States chemical deterrent program in fiscal year 1986. Of the total request, $936.0 million or 73 percent is for protective measures; $207 million or 16 percent is for retaliatory programs; and $132 million or 10 percent is for the demilitarization of existing unitary munitions. The funding profile is as follows:

CHEMICAL DETERRENT PROGRAM

[Dollars in millions]

Protective measures:	
RDT&E	391.0
O&M	233.0
Procurement	283.0
MilCon [1]	29.0
Total	936.0
Retaliatory capability:	
RDT&E	33.0
Procurement of equipment	98.0
Procurement of munitions	65.0
MilCon [1]	11.0
Total	207.0
Demilitarization:	
RDT&E	10.0
O&M	66.0
Procurement	49.0

MilCon [1]	7.0
Total	132.0

[1] Authorized in Division B of this bill.

In a series of hearings this year, the committee received extensive testimony from active duty and retired general officers, and Department of Defense officials regarding the requirement for a credible United States chemical deterrent capability. The committee concentrated on the military implications of the current asymmetry in United States/Soviet chemical warfare capabilities. On the basis of this analysis, the committee views the modernization of our chemical deterrent with binary munitions as one of our highest national security priorities.

The committee reached this conclusion based on several key judgments. First, although the current United States stockpile of chemical weapons is large, it is not adequate to deter chemical attacks against United States and allied troops. Fully 90 percent of the stockpile is either obsolete, or in the form of munitions for which DOD has no delivery means. This finding was confirmed by the National Academy of Sciences in its December 1984 report entitled, "Disposal of Chemical Munitions and Agents". To quote from that report, "About 90 percent of the inventory of chemical agent and nearly as much of the munitions inventory has little or no military value and will require disposal regardless of future decisions regarding the binary weapons program."

In view of the inadequacy of our current stockpile of chemical weapons, the committee addressed the issue of whether the United States could meet the Soviet chemical warfare threat through defensive measures alone. The United States has invested considerable resources in protective measures over the past several years, and this area again consumes the largest percentage of this year's budget request. Chemical protective gear will save the lives of troops subject to chemical attack, but it also severely degrades their combat effectiveness. This gear is bulky and uncomfortable, and heat stress is a serious problem. The resulting degradation in battlefield effectiveness can be 50 percent or more, and it is likely to be decisive in combat. As General Frederick Kroesen USA (ret.), the former Commander-in-Chief of the United States Army, Europe, stated in testimony before the committee last year, "...no defensive measures can begin to redress the operational imbalance that occurs if one side can employ chemical weapons and the other cannot."

In view of the significant degradation in battlefield effectiveness that results from the use of chemical weapons, the committee believes that an effective United States chemical retaliatory capability should be sufficient to deter Soviet initiation of chemical warfare. During World War II, Allied possession of a chemical retaliatory capability deterred Hitler from using chemical weapons even in the last desperate days of the war. Today, the United States does not have a credible deterrent capability. The lack of such a capability undermines the United States' ability to conduct a successful conventional defense of Europe, and thus lowers the nuclear threshold.

For a relatively modest investment in modern binary munitions, the United States could have an effective chemical deterrent and yet maintain a stockpile of chemical weapons much smaller than the largely unusable one we possess today. In addition, binary munitions are safe to store and handle because they do not form a lethal agent until after firing or release. Therefore, they do not pose the same safety and environmental hazards as the unitary munitions in our stockpile today.

A final factor in support of the binary modernization program is its relationship to United States arms control objectives. To date, the Soviets have not responded favorably to the United States proposal before the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva to ban all chemical weapons. Absent the modernization of our stockpile, the Soviets will have little incentive to forego the advantages they currently enjoy, and join us in this effort.

The committee recognizes that this is an emotional and politically unpopular issue. However, the committee is firmly convinced that the case for the modernization of the chemical stockpile with binary munitions is compelling both from a military and from an environmental standpoint, and that it is one of the most urgent national security requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for the chemical deterrent program in fiscal year 1986.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	CHASSIS TRAILER GEN 2 1/2 TON 2W M200A1	1676	7.6			1676	7.6
2	DOLLY SET, TRANS SHELTER, 7 1/2T, M1022	141	5.5			141	5.5
3	MOTORCYCLE, GED, 2W, ROUGH TERRAIN	1413	5.6			1413	5.6
5	SEMITRAILER, BB/CONT 34T M872 C/S	100	3.4			100	3.4
6	SEMITRAILER, LB, 12T M270A1-M269A1	238	9.3			238	9.3
7	SEMITRAILER, LOW BED, 40T M870 (C/S)	311	12.2			311	12.2
8	SEMITRAILER, LOW BED HET, XM1000	144	11.2			144	11.2
9	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	484	19.8			484	19.8
11	TRAILER, CARGO, 3/4T, 2W, M101A2 W/E	1241	5.3			1241	5.3
12	TRAILER, CARGO, 1 1/2T, 2W, M105A2	3099	11.1			3099	11.1
14	TRAILER, TANK WATER 400G 1 1/2T 2W M149A	650	4.0			650	4.0
15	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)(MYP)	13383	326.0			13383	326.0
16	FAST ATTACK VEHICLE	88	3.1	-88	-3.1	0	0.0
18	SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE (SUSV)	135	14.8			135	14.8
19	TRUCK, 5T, 6X6, ABT (MYP)	2179	225.3			2179	225.3
20	TRUCK, 10T, 8X8, ABT (MYP)	770	128.7			770	128.7
21	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	42	3.1			42	3.1
22	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQUIPMENT		0.1				0.1
23	SHOP EQUIPMENT, AUTO MAINT & REP	104	0.9			104	0.9
24	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (TAC VEH)		1.7				1.7
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
25	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2464	30.0			2464	30.0
26	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		39.9				39.9
27	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		13.0				13.0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
28	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		135.2				135.2
	SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		1016.8		-3.1		1013.7
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	TELECOMM EQUIP - READ CMD COMM						
31	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		0.3				0.3
32	CLASSIFIED PROJECT 9WW		14.2				14.2
	TELECOMM EQUIP - JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROG						
34	MOD RCRD TFC TERM (MRTT)		39.9				39.9
35	DIG GROUP MULTIIPLEXER (DGM)		20.4				20.4
36	RPTR/TERM ASSMBLGS		15.7				15.7
37	RADIO TERMINALS AN/TRC-170		29.2				29.2
39	UNIT LEVEL SWITCHES		31.4				31.4
40	COM SYS CON EL AN/TYQ-16		15.9				15.9
41	DIG NSEC VTER TA-954	4500	4.0			4500	4.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
42	ANDVT-TAC TERM, CV-3591	159	4.0			159	4.0
43	LIGHTWEIGHT DIGITAL FACSIMILE	275	7.4			275	7.4
44	MOB SUBSCRIBER EQP		335.3				335.3
45	MOD OF IN-SVC EQ (TRI-TAC)		22.5				22.5
	TELECOMM EQUIP - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM						
46	COMM SYS (HTLD)		8.5				8.5
47	SINCGARS (ROLL)	16400	231.3			16400	231.3
48	COMMUNICATIONS CENTRAL, AN/TSC-99	3	11.7			3	11.7
51	IMP HF RADIO FAMILY		26.6				26.6
53	PWR SUPPLY PP-6148/U	110	0.9			110	0.9
55	RADIO SET AN/PRC-70	305	11.6			305	11.6
56	ANTENNA GROUP OE-254	4000	2.5			4000	2.5
57	SMALL UNIT TRANS AN/PRC - 68	510	1.0			510	1.0
61	TELETYPEWRITER TERMINAL AN/UGC-74	310	4.2			310	4.2
62	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (CSC)		26.0				26.0
63	RDF COMM (S.W. ASIA)		19.5				19.5
64	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (CSC-C-E)		10.1				10.1
66	SPEC OPS COMM SUP ELMT		7.3				7.3
	TELECOMM EQUIP - STARCOM NON-DCS						
69	AR TELECOM AUTO PR (ATCAP)		9.2				9.2
70	C-E FACILITIES/PROJECTS		20.5				20.5
71	SOUTHCOM C3 UPGRADE		26.9				26.9
72	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG(EMCP)		0.6				0.6
	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)						
73	AUTODIN (DCS)		4.8				4.8
75	DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN)		6.5				6.5
77	TRANSMISSION MEDIA (EUCOM)		16.2				16.2
78	TRANSMISSION MEDIA (PACOM)		30.9				30.9
79	WW TECH CON IMP PR (WWTCIP)		5.3				5.3
	TELECOMM EQUIP - SATCOM-GRD ENVIRONMENT						
80	DIGITAL EQUIPMENT (DSCS)		40.0				40.0
81	INTERCONNECT FACILITY (DSCS)		7.9				7.9
82	JAM RESISTANT SECURE COM (JRSC)		22.9				22.9
83	MED SAT TERM AN/GSC		62.1				62.1
84	SPRD SPEC MUL ACC (DSCS)		23.0				23.0
85	DSCS OPERATIONS CONTROL SYS (DOCS)		40.4				40.4
86	MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (DSCS)		8.5				8.5
87	MPK SAT UHF TERM, AN/PSC-3	114	3.9			114	3.9
88	VEH SAT UHF TERM, AN/VSC-7	22	1.4			22	1.4
89	SINGLE CHANNEL OBJECT TACT TERM (SCOTT)		83.4				83.4
90	MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		53.4				53.4
	TELECOMM EQUIP - EUCOM C3 SYSTEM						
91	EUCOM C3 (NWS)		98.6				98.6
93	EUCOM ALTERNATE SPT HQ (ASH)		11.5				11.5

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TELECOMM EQUIP - COMSEC EQUIPMENT						
96	AUTO KEY DC KGX-93/TSEC	147	4.3			147	4.3
97	SEC VO IMPRV PRG (COMSEC)		8.4				8.4
98	LOOP KEY GEN TSEC/KG-82	1520	2.1			1520	2.1
99	KEY VAR GEN TSEC/KG-83	59	0.4			59	0.4
100	DED LOOP ENCRYP DEV KG-84	5525	21.8			5525	21.8
101	TNK ENCRP DEV TSEC/KG-93	212	2.2			212	2.2
102	TSEC/KG-94	828	7.8			828	7.8
104	INT LEV T SET TSEC/ST-34	14	0.8			14	0.8
105	DIG SUB VOICE TSEC/KY-68	525	2.0			525	2.0
106	TSEC/KY-90	141	5.4			141	5.4
108	KEY GENERATOR, TSEC/KG-87	7	2.0			7	2.0
110	COMSEC MODULE, TSEC/KGV-13	320	5.1			320	5.1
111	FREQ MODULE, KGV-10/TSEC	17120	18.2			17120	18.2
113	ELEC TRAN DEV KYK-13/TSEC	7272	1.5			7272	1.5
114	NET CON DEV KYX-15/TSEC	2236	1.8			2236	1.8
115	SPEECH SECUR EQ TSEC/KY-57	7442	31.5			7442	31.5
118	TSEC/KYV-5 (VACTOR) SECURE EQUIP	205	0.9			205	0.9
119	TEMPEST (COMSEC)		1.1				1.1
122	TSEC/KGV-11/SECURE MODULE		1.3				1.3
124	UMSTEAD CC (CI-11-1)		3.0				3.0
125	UMSTEAD RT (CI-11-2)		6.8				6.8
126	BATSON II, TSEC/CI-14		8.4				8.4
127	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (COMSEC)		4.5				4.5
	TELECOMM EQUIP - BASE COMM						
128	BASE COMM (CONUS)		34.6				34.6
129	BASE COMM (EUCOM)		6.8				6.8
130	BASE COMM (PACOM)		4.0				4.0
131	DA COMD & CON SYS (DACCS)		10.3				10.3
132	ARMY OPNS CTR		5.0				5.0
133	PENTAGON TELECOM CTR (PTC)		9.8				9.8
	TMDE FOR TELECOMM						
134	TMDE MODERNIZATION		27.0				27.0
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT						
138	TRAILBLAZER	2	38.4			2	38.4
139	TAC ELEC SURV SYS		15.8				15.8
141	MANPACK RADIO DF SYSTEM (MRDFS)	19	7.0			19	7.0
142	TEAM PACK	4	6.0			4	6.0
143	MOD IN SER EQ (INT SPT)		20.2				20.2
144	RESERVE TACTICAL INTEL ENHANCEMENT		0.9				0.9
145	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (INT SPT-C-E)		4.7				4.7
146	FT DEVENS TRAINING SUPPORT		0.4				0.4
147	TROJAN		5.3				5.3
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - GEN DEF INTEL PROG						
148	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS (IDHS)		[ ]				[ ]
149	TECH RECON AND SURV SYS (TECRAS)		[ ]				[ ]
150	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (GDIP-C-E)		[ ]				[ ]

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - AUTO DATA PROCESS SYS						
151	VERT INSTL AUTO BASELINE (VIABLE-BASOPS)		18.7				18.7
152	VERTICAL FORCE DEVELOP MIS		6.3				6.3
154	BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM	89	17.7			89	17.7
156	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM-ADDS		21.6				21.6
158	USAREUR TACTICAL AUTOMATION		2.2				2.2
159	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUP (LCSS)		3.5				3.5
160	ADPE FOR NON TAC MGT INFO SYS		9.4				9.4
162	DIGITAL MESSAGE DEVICE	701	13.2			701	13.2
163	FIRE SUPPORT TEAM DIGITAL MESSAGE	427	17.2			427	17.2
164	MANEUVER CONTROL SYS		72.3				72.3
165	MOD IN-SVC CMD/CONTROL (C2)		2.9				2.9
166	CORPS/THEATER ADP SVC CTR (CTASC)		8.9				8.9
167	TACT ARMY CMBT COMPT SY(TACCS)	2522	44.7			2522	44.7
169	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR XM-23	882	6.0			882	6.0
170	CSS LOG APPLC AUTO MARK/READ SYMBS(LOG MA		10.6				10.6
171	WW MIL COM & CONT SYS ADPE		7.1				7.1
172	UNIT LEVEL COMPUTER (ULC)		5.5				5.5
	AUDIO VISUAL						
173	AFRTS (AUDIO VISUAL)		4.3				4.3
174	DIG STRG & RTRVL ENGRG DATA SYS (DSREDS)		25.3				25.3
175	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (A/V-C-E)		14.3				14.3
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE						
177	COUNTERMEASURES SET AN/TLQ-17A	12	5.7			12	5.7
179	TACJAM, AN/MLQ-34	6	19.0			6	19.0
180	EW (HTLD)		5.2				5.2
182	MOD IN-SVC EQUIP (EW)		2.1				2.1
183	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (EW-C-E)		2.9				2.9
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - TACTICAL ELECTRONICS						
184	CHARGER, RADIAC DETECTOR PP-4370/PD	2840	3.8			2840	3.8
185	BATTERY CHARGER PP-7286/U	450	3.5			450	3.5
186	POWER SUPPLY, PP-6224	631	1.9			631	1.9
187	COMPUTER/INDICATOR, CP-696/PD	1160	4.0			1160	4.0
188	METEROLOGICAL DATA SYS (FAMAS)	21	33.1			21	33.1
189	GROUND LASER LOCATOR DESIGNATOR (GLLD)	180	45.1			180	45.1
191	INTRUSION DETECTION DEVICES		16.6				16.6
192	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM	264	9.7			264	9.7
193	POSITION/AZIMUTH DETERMINING SYS (PADS)	97	36.4			97	36.4
195	TAM-6 NIGHT SIGHT MAINTENANCE FACILITY	17	4.2			17	4.2
196	AN/TAM-3 TEST SET, NIGHT VISION SIGHT	83	2.3			83	2.3
199	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		65.0				65.0
200	NIGHT VISION SIGHT INDIV WPN AN/PVS-4	3661	9.9			3661	9.9
201	POSITION LOCATION REPORTING SYS (PLRS)		45.1				45.1
204	RADIAC SET AN/VDR-2	827	2.0			827	2.0
205	REMBASS		22.0				22.0
206	RPV TA/DESIGN AERIAL RECON SYS (TADARS)		134.6		-30.0		104.6
207	TACTICAL DOSIMETER, IM-185	5543	2.4			5543	2.4
209	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE EQ (TAC EL)		3.5				3.5
210	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (TACT ELEC-C-E)		14.5				14.5

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TMDE FOR TACTICAL ELECTRONICS						
211	TEST STA, ELECTRONIC EQUIP,AN/USM-410	6	8.9			6	8.9
213	TMDE FOR STE/ICE	981	5.6			981	5.6
214	CORE ELECTRONIC AUTO TEST (STE-X)	103	8.5			103	8.5
	OTHER ELECT SYS/EQUIP - SUP EQUIP AND FAC						
215	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (TELECOM)		215.4				215.4
216	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (COMSEC)		14.6				14.6
217	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (OTHER)		218.0				218.0
218	WAR RESERVE SPARES		32.8				32.8
219	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		95.0				95.0
220	QUICK RETURN ON INVESTMENT (QRIP) PGM		0.5				0.5
221	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUNDING		40.7				40.7
222	PROD ENHANCING CAP INVESTMENT PROG (PECIP)		1.0				1.0
223	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		5.5				5.5
	SUBTOTAL, COMM AND ELEC EQUIPMENT		3306.3		-30.0		3276.3
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
226	SIM DET CHEM AGENT AUTO ALARM XM81	692	4.7			692	4.7
227	DECONTAMINATE APP PWR DR LT WT XM17	379	6.4			379	6.4
230	MASK, PROTECTIVE, NBC	111490	30.3			111490	30.3
231	CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR	3260	19.4			3260	19.4
232	SIMP COLL PROT EQUIP XM20	310	3.9			310	3.9
233	MODULAR/COLL PROT EQUIP FOR VV AND S	100	3.1			100	3.1
236	GEN SET, SMOKE, MECH: PUL JET, XM157	145	4.2			145	4.2
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
239	BOAT, BRIDGE ERECTION, DE, 27 FT	185	25.4			185	25.4
240	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, INTERIOR BAY	180	7.1			180	7.1
241	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, RAMP	87	3.8			87	3.8
242	BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON, TRANSPORTER	156	18.0			156	18.0
243	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (BRIDGING)		0.9				0.9
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
245	GEMSS AUX MINE DISPNSR XM138 (FLIPPER)	237	2.0			237	2.0
246	DISPENSER MINE XM139	18	2.5			18	2.5
247	LAUNCHER, MINE CLEARING LINE CHARGE	115	1.4			115	1.4
248	MARKING SYS, CLEAR LANE	65	3.0			65	3.0
249	E DET SET, MINE, MET/NON-MET, AN/PRS-8	5927	8.1			5927	8.1
252	MINE CLEARING ROLLER	50	3.5			50	3.5
253	REMOTE CONTROL UNIT (MOPMS)	581	4.6			581	4.6
254	M-9 ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER (ACE)	70	65.0			70	65.0
255	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (ENG NON COSTR)		1.9				1.9
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
256	AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITIES		19.1				19.1

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
257	FIELD KITCHEN, MOBILE, TRL MTD.	327	5.3			327	5.3
259	DIVING EQUIPMENT		0.4				0.4
260	FIRETRUCKS		8.6				8.6
264	TAG PRINTING AND BINDING EQUIPMENT		5.4				5.4
265	HALON RECHARGE SERVICE KIT	132	2.1			132	2.1
266	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (CSS-EQ)		10.0				10.0
267	MODIFICATIONS OF IN SERVICE EQUIP (CSE)		3.8				3.8
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
268	TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLL POL 50000 G	335	5.1			335	5.1
270	TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLLAPSIBLE POL 10000G	492	5.8			492	5.8
273	TANK UNIT TRLR MTD 600 GAL	826	1.9			826	1.9
274	PUMP ASSY LIQ GAS WHL 4 IN OUT 350 GPM	361	5.8			361	5.8
277	SWA PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		38.9				38.9
278	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (POL)		1.6				1.6
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
280	WTR PUR UNIT REV OS 2000/3000 GPM TK MID	16	14.0			16	14.0
281	WATER PUR UNIT, REV OSMOSIS, 600GPH	95	24.0			95	24.0
286	TACTICAL WATER DISTR SYS	2	8.3			2	8.3
289	TANK, FABRIC, COLL, WTR, SEMI-TRLR MTD	140	1.6			140	1.6
290	SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	118	2.2			118	2.2
292	PUMP CENTRIFUGAL, 65GPM	2183	3.4			2183	3.4
293	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (WATER EQ)		1.9				1.9
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
294	DEPLOYABLE MEDICAL SYSTEM (DMS)		84.4				84.4
295	COMBAT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT MEDICAL		77.5				77.5
296	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		83.9				83.9
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
297	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP	740	38.0			740	38.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-11.0				-11.0
			--------				--------
	NET		27.0				27.0
301	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	232	9.8			232	9.8
302	SHOP EQ ELECTRICAL RPR SEMI-TRL MTD	82	13.5			82	13.5
307	CALIBRATION SET SUPPORT		7.7				7.7
308	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (MAIN EQUIP)		9.5				9.5
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
313	TRACTOR FULL TRACKED LOW SPEED DD MED	129	26.4			129	26.4
314	SMALL EMPLACEMENT EXCAVATOR (SEE)	356	25.3			356	25.3
320	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (CONSTRUCTION)		7.7				7.7
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
321	LANDING, CRAFT, UTILITY	5	22.9			5	22.9
324	RO/RO DISCHARGE PLATFORM	2	11.8			2	11.8

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
325	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS		13.4				13.4
329	MODIFICATIONS OF IN-SERV EQ (FLOAT/RAIL)		1.0				1.0
330	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (FLOAT/RAIL)		4.2				4.2
	GENERATORS						
331	GEN AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	5311	99.4			5311	99.4
	MATERIEL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
333	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, GE, PT, 6000 LB	354	13.5			354	13.5
334	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, GE, SRT, 2000 LB	123	2.9			123	2.9
336	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 6000 LB	250	26.3			250	26.3
337	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, ELEC, SRT, 6000 LB	116	4.6			116	4.6
338	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, ELEC, SRT FRT/SIDE LDR	23	2.0			23	2.0
339	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, ELEC, SRT, 4000 LB	424	12.9			424	12.9
340	65 TON CRANE	11	6.2			11	6.2
341	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 (MHE)		6.0				6.0
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
342	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		37.7				37.7
344	AREA ORIENTED DEPOT UPGRADE		73.8				73.8
345	VALUE ENGINEERING (VE)		0.6				0.6
348	PROJECT RESHAPE (HQ DARCOM)		14.6		-8.0		6.6
349	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		7.9				7.9
352	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		11.2				11.2
353	HOST NATION SUPPORT - EUROPE		58.2				58.2
354	NATIONAL TRAINING CTR SUP		13.3				13.3
356	SWA STAGING BASES		6.4				6.4
357	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		177.8		-20.0		157.8
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1389.7		-28.0		1361.7
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT		5712.8		-61.1		5651.7

5-TON TRUCK

The administration requested $225.3 million for the procurement of 2,179 5-ton trucks.

The 5-ton truck, under procurement on a 5-year multi-year contract approved in 1981, has been one of the Army's more successful acquisition programs. In 1984, the Army proposed a competition for a new engine to be installed in future 5-ton trucks. The committee supports this competition. However, the committee believes that as currently structured, the proposed competition is inadequate for the following reasons.

First, the Army's plan is to select the winning contractor on the basis of only 3,000 miles of testing. The winning vehicle/engine combination will then be subjected to 200,000 miles of mission testing. The committee believes that mission-specific testing should be performed and evaluated before rather than after source selection. That testing should emphasize both design durability (including 20,000 miles in mission profiles) and design performance reliability (including high ambient temperature cooling, cold starting, deep water fording, grade climbing, and engine noise).

Second, the committee is concerned that the competition take into account the impact on logistics that may result from the selection of an engine not currently in the inventory. All costs should be considered (including logistics costs), not just the cost of developing and procuring the new engine.

Third, questions have been raised over the Army's approach to ensuring that whichever engine is selected fully complies with all emission standards established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The committee expects that, whichever engine is selected, it will meet all applicable EPA standards at the time of delivery to the Army.

The committee recommends an authorization of $225.3 million for the procurement of 2,179 5-ton trucks as requested by the administration. The committee also recommends approval of authority to extend the current multi-year contract (1981-1985) for a period not to exceed 18 months to avoid a break in the production and delivery of 5-ton trucks to the field. The 3-year multi-year competitive contract (1986-1988, with two 1-year fixed price options) shall commence using fiscal year 1986 funds and source selection shall be made as soon as possible, but not later than May 1, 1986.

Should it become clear during the testing program that it will not be possible to complete source selection by May 1, 1986, the Secretary of the Army may request relief from that deadline. The Secretary's request must be made by February 1, 1986. Should such relief be necessary, the Secretary may also request an extension of the existing contract beyond the 18 month period specified in the preceding paragraph. This extraordinary provision is to be exercised only if the testing program reveals systematic problems with all of the contractor proposals. Failure of an individual contractor's proposal to perform as expected does not constitute sufficient justification to warrant an appeal for relief from the source selection deadline.

The committee understands that a new engine installation will entail only minor modifications to the M939 technical data package in order to achieve the maximum benefits from the engine competition.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of 5-ton trucks.

MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIPMENT (MSE)

The Mobile Subscriber Equipment (MSE) program is a communications system intended to provide mobile and stationary users at Corps and Division levels with automated communications. It will provide voice, data and facsimile communications, and will serve as a primary communications network in the future for Army combat and support operations. The administration requested $335.3 million to continue the procurement of existing radio-telephone equipment.

MSE is being procured as a "non-development item" (NDI), which means that the Army will spend no Research and Development funds on the program. This approach, if successful, will expedite fielding of urgently needed communications equipment for the Army.

While the NDI approach offers clear advantages in promptly fielding equipment, it is inconsistent with congressional directions for substantial operational testing before committing to the procurement of a multi-billion dollar system. In the case of the MSE such testing appears necessary to address concerns over the issues of interoperability and susceptibility to electronic jamming.

The committee directs the Army to conduct realistic operational testing, specifically for the purpose of identifying any shortcomings in the area of interoperability and resistance to electronic countermeasures. The committee does not wish to delay prompt fielding of the system, but reserves judgment on the full scope of the program until being advised of the Army's plans for full system testing including operations in a jamming environment. The committee directs that no more than half of the funds provided for the procurement of MSE may be obligated before the Army provides to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services a plan outlining the testing program required to resolve any uncertainties in the performance of the MSE system. The committee will use that plan as a benchmark to evaluate the progress of the MSE program.

In addition, the committee directs the Army to provide to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services by January 1, 1986, a report describing all modifications to the selected system (as the system was demonstrated) which will be required prior to procurement for use by the Army, and any planned upgrades to the equipment subsequent to initial procurement.

HF RADIOS

The committee recommends the authorization of $10 million for the procurement of high frequency radios. This authorization is to provide the Army discretionary authority to begin procurement of a new generation light weight HF radio.

Several models of light weight HF radios are currently in various stages of development. Following testing and evaluation, the Army would be permitted to make a source selection and begin procurement.

REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES (AQUILA)

The administration requested $134.6 million for the procurement of Aquila Remotely Piloted Vehicles (RPVs). The Aquila is a small unmanned vehicle designed to perform target acquisition, designation, aerial reconnaissance, artillery adjustment missions, and battlefield post-strike assessment. The system is designed to include a laser designation capability for Army (and possibly Air Force) laser guided munitions.

At the inception of the Aquila program, the Army estimated the total program costs at $563 million (May 1978). The current estimate (in base year dollars) according to the December 31, 1984 Selected Acquisition Report (SAR), is $2,131.1 million to procure 543 air vehicles and the necessary ground control stations and support vehicles. The significant program cost increase is due primarily to: (1) technical problems; (2) program stretchout from 43 to 79 months for full scale development; and (3) the addition of capability enhancements such as the FLIR (Forward Looking Infra-Red) and laser designation feature.

The committee strongly supports the development of RPVs for use by the military. However, the committee does not endorse the approach taken thus far by the Defense Department to develop these systems.

The current Army plan calls for the development of 543 air vehicles identically equipped with a highly sophisticated mission package (only the TV and FLIR units are interchangeable) which will enable the Aquila to perform a wide variety of missions in the very hostile electronic warfare environment postulated for a conflict in central Europe. While the committee believes that the development of this capability is warranted, it is not clear that this very sophisticated and expensive capability must be incorporated into every air vehicle. Not all missions will require the complete avionics package currently planned for Aquila. Some missions, in a relatively benign environment, may require only a simple TV or FLIR sensor without the laser designation capability and anti-jam data link. For such missions, the use of a fully equipped Aquila would appear extravagant.

The committee believes the more practical and economical approach would be to develop a basic air vehicle capable of accommodating a variety of mission payloads. Additionally, the committee believes that the Army, in coordination with the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, should undertake the development of a family of RPVs that would take advantage of the peculiar benefits of a variety of vehicles. For instance, while the Aquila thus far has demonstrated flight endurance in the range of 3 hours, other systems have been operated successfully in excess of 10 hours. Some are designed to operate at high altitudes or high air speeds, while others are best suited for long endurance or low altitude flight.

The committee directs the Army to provide a report to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services no later than December 15, 1985 that addresses the preceding concerns. This report should specifically address the restructuring of the Aquila program to provide for a basic air vehicle with a variety of mission payloads, and the proposed development of a family of RPVs. Consideration should also be given in this report to the procurement of off-the-shelf systems (as both the Army and Navy have recently done).

The committee recommends an authorization of $104.6 million, a reduction of $30.0 million from the administration's request for the Aquila system. The funds authorized should be sufficient to maintain the option of initiating Aquila production, once the Army has satisfactorily addressed the committee's concerns. Furthermore, of the amount authorized for the procurement of Remotely Piloted Vehicles, no less than $3 million shall be applied to procure "off-the-shelf" vehicles for evaluation.

M-9 ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER (ACE)

The administration requested $65 million for the procurement of 70 M-9 Armored Combat Earthmovers (ACE). The ACE is a tracked, armored earthmoving machine designed to provide engineer support to forward deployed combat units.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request, although the committee denies the administration's request for authority to negotiate a multi-year contract for the M-9 system.

SHIP TO SHORE EQUIPMENT

In the Army's Other Procurement account were several programs designed to support ship-to-shore movement of cargo and petroleum. Although individually small, these programs provide equipment critical to support of forces ashore.

The committee recommends against applying any general reduction against the following programs: SWA petroleum distribution (line 277); rail/float/containerization equipment (lines 321-330); and SWA staging bases (line 356).

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	A-6E (ATTACK) INTRUDER	6	213.9			6	213.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-11.3				-11.3
	NET		202.6				202.6
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		11.6				11.6
3	EA-6B (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROWLER	12	467.5			12	467.5
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-21.2				-21.2
	NET		446.3				446.3
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		33.0				33.0
5	AV-8B (V/STOL)	46	972.9	-3	-45.0	43	927.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-80.4				-80.4
	NET		892.5		-45.0		847.5
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		86.6		-10.0		76.6
7	F-14A (FIGHTER) TOMCAT	18	838.6	-3	-100.0	15	738.6
	LESS: ADVANCF PROCUREMENT (PY)		-185.0				-185.0
	NET		653.6		-100.0		553.6
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		148.2		-30.0		118.2
9	F/A-18 (FIGHTER) HORNET	84	2701.4			84	2701.4
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-207.7				-207.7
	NET		2493.7				2493.7
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		268.1		-53.0		215.1
11	CH/MH-53E (HELO) SUPER STALLION (MYP)	14	279.1		-6.0	14	273.1
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-19.0				-19.0
	NET		260.1		-6.0		254.1
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		33.3				33.3
13	AH-1T (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	22	217.0			22	217.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-15.0				-15.0
	NET		202.0				202.0
15	SH-60B (ASW HELO) SEAHAWK	18	373.5	6	41.0	24	414.5
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-57.9				-57.9
	NET		315.6		41.0		356.6
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54.9				54.9
18	CV ASW HELO ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30.0				30.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
19	P-3C (PATROL) ORION (MYP)	9	418.9		-6.0	9	412.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-89.0				-89.0
	NET		329.9		-6.0		323.9
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		156.6		-30.0		126.6
22	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	6	358.0			6	358.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-29.6				-29.6
	NET		328.4				328.4
23	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		31.3				31.3
24	SH-2F (ASW HELO) SEASPRITE	6	74.4		-5.0	6	69.4
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-4.5				-4.5
	NET		69.9		-5.0		64.9
	ROUNDING ADJUSTMENT		-0.1				-0.1
	SUBTOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		7048.0		-244.0		6804.0
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
27	UC-12B/CX	12	26.9	-12	-26.9	0	0.0
28	C-2 (MYP)	8	177.9			8	177.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-43.0				-43.0
	NET		134.9				134.9
29	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		35.2				35.2
	SUBTOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		197.0		-26.9		170.1
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
30	T-34C	38	49.4	-38	-49.4	0	0.0
32	ADVERSARY (F-16)	12	115.7			12	115.7
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT		165.1		-49.4		115.7
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
36	E-6A	2	395.0			2	395.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-97.7				-97.7
	NET		297.3				297.3
37	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		58.3				58.3
40	VH-60	9	129.7			9	129.7
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-26.9				-26.9
	NET		102.8				102.8
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT		458.4		0.0		458.4

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
42	A-3 SERIES		5.4				5.4
43	A-4 SERIES		17.0				17.0
44	A-6 SERIES		240.5				240.5
45	EA-6 SERIES		45.4				?45.4
46	A-7 SERIES		30.0				30.0
47	AV-8 SERIES		8.1				8.1
48	F-4 SERIES		5.0				5.0
49	RF-4 SERIES		2.5				2.5
50	F-14 SERIES		158.8				158.8
51	F-8 SERIES		0.1				0.1
52	F-5 SERIES		1.7				1.7
53	OV-10 SERIES		51.5				51.5
54	F-18 SERIES		17.8				17.8
55	H-46 SERIES		137.0				137.0
56	H-53 SERIES		40.3				40.3
57	SH-60 SERIES		1.6				1.6
58	H-1 SERIES		75.4				75.4
59	H-2 SERIES		33.9				33.9
60	H-3 SERIES		98.0				98.0
61	EP-3 SERIES		38.5				38.5
62	P-3 SERIES		152.9				152.9
63	S-3 SERIES		284.3				284.3
65	E-2 SERIES		72.1				72.1
67	TRAINER A/C SERIES		5.3				5.3
75	EC-130 SERIES		6.5				6.5
76	C-130 SERIES		12.5				12.5
77	FEWSG		22.7				22.7
78	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		6.9				6.9
80	VARIOUS		15.6				15.6
81	POWER PLANT CHANGES		8.3				8.3
82	MISC FLT SAFETY/OPER NECESSITY CHANGES		4.3				4.3
83	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		242.0				242.0
84	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		23.9				23.9
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-30.0		-30.0
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		1865.7		-30.0		1835.7
	AIRCRAFT SPARES						
85	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1463.7		-40.0		1423.7
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
86	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		684.8				684.8
87	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		57.1				57.1
88	WAR CONSUMABLES		65.0				65.0
89	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		57.7				57.7
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-50.0		-50.0
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIP AND FACILITIES		864.7		-50.0		814.7
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-31.0		-31.0
	ROUNDING ADJUSTMENT		0.1				0.1
	TOTAL, NAVY AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT		12062.6		-471.3		11591.3

A-6E (INTRUDER)

The administration requested $202.6 million for the procurement of 6 A-6E Intruder aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $11.6 million for advance procurement of 6 A-6Es in 1987. The A-6E is an all-weather, carrier based, medium attack aircraft currently operated by both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for procurement of A-6E aircraft. (For further discussion of the A-6E, see A-6E Improvements in the Navy research and development account.)

EA-6B (PROWLER) ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $446.3 million for the procurement of 12 EA-6B aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $33.0 million in advance procurement for 12 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The EA-6B is a carrier-based, electronic jamming aircraft designed to protect strike aircraft through electronic countermeasures.

The committee is pleased to note that, in the case of the EA-6B, the Navy has responded to its repeated urging to increase aircraft production rates to more efficient levels. For several years the Navy has procured the EA-6B at a rate of 6 aircraft per year (in 1984 2 additional EA-6Bs were added by the Congress for a total of 8 aircraft). At this very inefficient production rate, the unit cost of the EA-6B was in excess of $60 million per aircraft. By increasing the production rate to 12 aircraft in 1986, the unit cost is reduced to $38.9 million each. The committee strongly supports the Navy's decision to increase the production rate of the EA-6B.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of the EA-6B aircraft for the Navy.

AV-8B HARRIER V/STOL ATTACK AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $892.5 million for the procurement of 46 AV-8B aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $86.6 million in advance procurement for 47 aircraft in fiscal year 1987. The AV-8B Harrier is a vertical/short-take-off-and-land (V/STOL) attack aircraft which will replace the AV-8A in the Marine Corps inventory.

The committee recommends authorization of $847.5 million for the procurement of 43 AV-8B Harriers in fiscal year 1986 and $76.6 million in advance procurement for 44 aircraft in 1987. These adjustments are strictly the result of congressionally mandated budget reductions and are made without prejudice.

F-14 (TOMCAT) FIGHTER AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $653.6 million for the procurement of 18 F-14 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $148.2 million in advance procurement for 18 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The F-14 Tomcat is a two-place, variable geometry, fleet defense fighter. Equipped with Phoenix, Sparrow, Sidewinder missiles, and a 20mm cannon, the F-14 is the Navy's primary fleet air defense aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $553.6 million for the procurement of 15 F-14 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $118.2 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1987.

F/A-18 (HORNET) FIGHTER/ATTACK AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $2,493.7 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $268.1 million in advance procurement funds for 102 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The F/A-18 Hornet is a high performance, carrier-based aircraft designed to perform both fighter and attack missions.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,493.7 million for the procurement of 84 F/A-18s in fiscal year 1986 and $215.1 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1987. The reduction in advance procurement of $53.0 million is made without prejudice and is strictly the result of budgetary constraints. The administration is encouraged to submit a request for a minimum of 96 F/A-18s in fiscal year 1987.

SH-60B LAMPS MK-III ASW HELICOPTER

The administration requested $315.6 million for 18 SH-60B LAMPS MK-III ASW helicopters and $54.9 million in advance procurement.

The SH-60B is the air subsystem of the Light Airborne Multi-Purpose System (LAMPS) Mark III weapon system. The LAMPS MK-III is a computer-integrated, ship/helicopter system optimized for anti-submarine warfare (ASW), but it includes secondary missions of anti-ship surveillance and targeting, search and rescue, vertical replenishment, and spotting naval gunfire. The SH-60B helicopter carries sonobuoys, MK-46 torpedoes and electronic equipment for the processing and transmission of acoustic and electronic warfare data.

For two years, the Senate and the House of Representatives have strongly endorsed the Department of the Navy's plan to procure LAMPS MK-III helicopters at a rate of 24 per year. The Congress has consistently encouraged the Department to maintain this production rate throughout the remaining years of the program.

The committee is disappointed that the Navy and the Department of Defense have ignored this guidance. The current five year defense plan calls for buying 18 SH-60Bs annually. The committee is puzzled by the Navy's request for six more of the older and less capable LAMPS MK-I aircraft at a cost of $69.9 million, even though an equal number of the superior LAMPS MK-III aircraft would cost $28.9 million less.

The committee recommends authorization of $356.6 million for procurement of 24 SH-60B aircraft and $54.9 million for advance procurement. This increase of $41 million provides for six additional helicopters. Future production rates of 24 per year can be supported without additional advance procurement funding.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the unit cost of SH-60Bs under four different procurement plans: 18 aircraft, purchased annually; 18 aircraft purchased under a multi-year contract; 24 aircraft, purchased annually; and 24 aircraft, purchased under a multi-year contract. A summary of findings from this review, together with the Secretary's recommendation for procuring additional SH-60Bs in fiscal year 1987, shall be provided by letter to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than February 5, 1986.

CV ASW HELICOPTER

The CV ASW helicopter program will procure a modified SH-60B aircraft equipped with a dipping sonar instead of LAMPS MK-III electronics. These helicopters are urgently need to replace older SH-3s.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's planned rate of procurement for CV ASW helicopters (30 per year) might not be achieved and that the Navy could incur excessive and unnecessary overhead rates if it plans for such a rate. To place these plans in perspective, the committee notes that the SH-60B request is only 18, even though the planned rate once was over 40 per year.

The committee takes no action at this time, except to advise the Navy of its concern.

P-3C ASW AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $329.9 million for procurement of nine P-3C ASW maritime patrol aircraft and $156.6 million for advance procurement.

The P-3C aircraft is a land-based, four engine, turboprop ASW patrol plane. It normally carries a crew of 12 for a 10-12 hour mission, typically at distances of 1000-1500 miles from home base. Missions include anti-submarine warfare, ocean reconnaissance, intelligence operations, and mining.

The request includes $51.2 million in advance procurement for support of a multi-year procurement contract beginning in fiscal year 1987.

The committee does not support the planned multi-year procurement for two reasons. First, initiation of this MYP reduces planning flexibility in later years, when the Navy and Congress alike will face difficult decisions on defense spending. Second, the multi-year procurement request provides savings of less than ten percent and incorporates a configuration change during the multi-year contract which violates the standing criteria for multi-year programs.

The committee supports an alternative use for the requested funds which will increase production efficiency for P-3C aircraft and also reduce budgetary pressure on the P-3C program in the outyears. The committee recommends that the MYP funds be used instead for production of three additional P-3C airframes, which would support the EP-3 program. The Navy already has a requirement to transfer 12 used P-3C airframes to the EP-3 program beginning in 1986. If some new airframes were used instead, the unit price of P-3Cs would be reduced due to higher production rates. Further, the Navy would avoid the cost of removing ASW electronics from existing aircraft. Alternatively, should the Navy decide to expand the fleet of EP-3 aircraft, these three aircraft could augment the existing plan for EP-3 modernization.

The committee recommends authorization of $450.5 million for procurement of nine P-3C aircraft, for 3 P-3C airframes, and for advance procurement of additional P-3C aircraft, which is a reduction of $36 million from the request. The committee does not support the proposal as presented for multi-year procurement of P-3C aircraft beginning in fiscal 1987.

E-2C HAWKEYE

The administration requested $328.4 million for the procurement of 6 E-2C aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $31.3 million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The committee recommends an authorization of $328.4 million for the procurement of 6 E-2C aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $31.3 million in advance procurement for 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

SH-2F LAMPS MK-I ASW HELICOPTER

The administration requested $69.9 million for procurement of LAMPS MK-I helicopters. No funds were requested for advance procurement of additional helicopters.

The SH-2F, a two-place twin engine helicopter with a single main lift rotor and anti-torque tail rotor, is the air subsystem of the LAMPS MK-I weapon system. As such, it deploys aboard FF-1040, FF-1052, and FFG-7 class frigates in the primary role of anti-submarine warfare and anti-ship surveillance and targeting. It has limited onboard capability to redetect, classify, and attack enemy submarines with two MK-46 torpedoes. For most missions of any duration it carries only one torpedo. It has secondary missions of search and rescue, medical evacuation and communications relay.

Last year, the committee endorsed further procurement of the SH-2F and authorized advance procurement for up to 12 SH-2F aircraft in fiscal year 1986. However, the Navy's failure to maintain the SH-60B (LAMPS MK-III) production at an efficient rate of 24 per year, together with this request for only 6 of the less capable LAMPS MK-I helicopters, has led the committee to reexamine its support for this program. The committee supports the Navy's current plan to cease production of SH-2F aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends authorization of $64.9 million for procurement of six SH-2F LAMPS MK-I helicopters, a reduction of $5.0 million. No funds may be obligated for advance procurement of additional SH-2F aircraft in fiscal year 1987, since the helicopters authorized in fiscal year 1986 will be the final procurement.

UC-12B/CX

The administration requested $26.9 million for the procurement of 12 UC-12B/CX aircraft for the Navy. The UC-12B is a twin turbo-prop aircraft used to provide administrative support to fleet commands, shore facilities and research organizations. CX refers to an unspecified aircraft which may be selected if the Navy determines the C-12 to be unable to meet mission requirements.

The committee is concerned that C-12 aircraft are being procured by the Defense Department without the benefits of competition. More often than not, this arrangement has resulted from Congressional direction to procure, on a sole source basis, aircraft that were not requested by the Defense Department. The committee believes that, properly competed, the Defense Department could realize a substantial savings in the procurement of these aircraft.

According to the program justification provided by the Navy, there is no indication that the Navy intends to compete the procurement of these aircraft. The committee considers such an approach unjustifiable.

The committee therefore recommends no funds be authorized for the procurement of UC-12B/CX aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

In Section 102 of the Defense Authorization bill, the committee has recommended a provision which will require any future procurement of C-12 or C-12 type aircraft be made on a fully competitive basis. This provision is intended to withdraw from the Secretary of Defense any flexibility to utilize the exceptions to competitive procurements as set forth in Section 2304, Title 10, United States Code.

C-2 GREYHOUND

The administration requested $134.9 million for the procurement of 8 C-2 aircraft in 1986 and $35.2 million in advance procurement for 9 aircraft in 1987. The C-2 is a twin engine, turbo-prop aircraft designed to perform the rapid response, Carrier Onboard Delivery (COD) mission. It is currently being purchased on a multi-year contract.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the C-2 Greyhound.

E-6A TACAMO

The administration requested $297.3 million for the procurement of 2 E-6A TACAMO aircraft in fiscal year 1986, and $58.3 million for advanced procurement of future aircraft. In addition, $86.3 million was requested for research and development of the E-6A under the Navy Strategic Communications program. The E-6A is the replacement aircraft for the aging EC-130 now performing the TACAMO mission.

The committee received the reports required by the conference report on the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization bill and is satisfied with the Department of Defense's review of alternative options for the TACAMO replacement aircraft. The committee applauds the Department's reported commitment to procurement of the E-6A aircraft in its Five Year Defense Plan.

The committee continues to support the E-6A as the preferred platform to perform this important mission. This judgment is based primarily on the greater range and endurance capabilities inherent in the E-6A aircraft. These capabilities will permit the E-6A to be based in the continental United States, which provides an important measure of enduring survivability.

The committee continues to be of the view that the United States sea-based deterrent can be no more effective or survivable than the communications system that supports it. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for the E-6A TACAMO aircraft in fiscal year 1986, as well as the full request for communications improvements that are required regardless of the airplane platform performing the TACAMO mission.

MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $1,865.7 million for the modification of Navy aircraft.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,804.7 for modification of Navy aircraft. This reduction of $61.0 million is based strictly on budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

AIRCRAFT SPARES

The administration requested $1,463.7 million for the procurement of Navy aircraft spares and repair parts. The committee recommends a reduction of $40.0 million from the administration's request. This recommendations is strictly the result of budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

The committee recommends an authorization of $1,423.7 million for the procurement of Navy aircraft spares and repair parts.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction of $31 million in the Aircraft Procurement, Navy account. It is to be applied against the H-2, H-3, P-3, S-3, C-130, and FEWSG modification and procurement programs. This reduction is in lieu of a reduction against the S-3 modification program.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
1	UGM-73A (C-3) POSEIDON		5.0				5.0
2	UGM-96A (C-4) TRIDENT I		77.0		-20.0		57.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-10.8				-10.8
			--------		--------		--------
	NET		66.2		-20.0		46.2
3	TRIDENT II		312.7				312.7
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		269.3				269.3
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
5	UGM-73A (C-3) POSEIDON MODS		15.0		-5.0		10.0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
7	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		4.5				4.5
8	ASTRONAUTICS		12.6				12.6
	SUBTOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES		685.3		-25.0		660.3
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
9	BGM-109 TOMAHAWK	249	698.2			249	698.2
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-28.0				-28.0
			--------				--------
	NET		670.2				670.2
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		64.6				64.6
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
11	AIM/RIM-7 F/M SPARROW	1872	359.2			1872	359.2
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		9.5				9.5
13	AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER	1220	85.8			1220	85.8
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8.0				8.0
15	AIM-54A/C (PHOENIX)	265	368.0			265	368.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-24.4				-24.4
			--------				--------
	NET		343.6				343.6
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		38.3				38.3
17	AGM-84A HARPOON	395	314.9			395	314.9
18	AGM-88A HARM	904	258.0			904	258.0
19	SM-1 MR		26.4				26.4
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		9.5				9.5

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
21	SM-2 MR	846	509.7			846	509.7
22	SM-2 ER	470	312.2			470	312.2
24	RAM	117	44.7			117	44.7
25	SIDEARM	168	20.5			168	20.5
26	HELLFIRE	1304	55.1			1304	55.1
27	LASER MAVERICK	1500	194.3			1500	194.3
28	IIR MAVERICK	195	27.8			195	27.8
29	AERIAL TARGETS		105.6				105.6
30	DRONES AND DECOYS		29.4				29.4
31	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		12.3				12.3
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
32	TOMAHAWK MODS		2.5				2.5
33	AIM/RIM-7E/F SPARROW MOD		2.3				2.3
34	AIM-9 SIDEWINDER MOD		30.3				30.3
35	AIM-54A/C PHOENIX MOD		13.2				13.2
36	AGM-84A HARPOON MOD		9.5				9.5
37	STANDARD MISSILES MOD		17.1				17.1
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
39	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		18.9				18.9
40	FLEET SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		56.3				56.3
41	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM		8.8				8.8
42	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		71.9				71.9
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		3730.5		0.0		3730.5
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
44	TORPEDO MK-48 ADCAP	123	417.4			123	417.4
46	TORPEDO MK-46 (MYP)	500	105.5			500	105.5
47	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		23.6				23.6
49	MK-60 CAPTOR		0.0	150	59.6	150	59.6
50	MOBILE TARGET MK-30 (MYP)	6	20.6			6	20.6
52	MK-38 MINI MOBILE TARGET	1200	3.5			1200	3.5
53	ASROC		15.6				15.6
	MODIFICATION OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
55	MOBILE MINE MK-67	280	23.7			280	23.7
56	TORPEDO MK-46 MODS (MYP)	672	91.9			672	91.9
57	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8.4				8.4
59	CAPTOR MODS		15.7				15.7
60	SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEM		1.5				1.5
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
61	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		47.4				47.4

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
62	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		23.2				23.2
	SUBTOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		798.0		59.6		857.6
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
64	MK-15 CLOSE IN WEAPONS SYSTEM	39	150.1			39	150.1
65	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT	6	20.0			6	20.0
66	MK-19/40MM MACHINE GUN	56	1.2			56	1.2
67	25MM GUN MOUNT	29	5.5		-2.5	29	3.0
68	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		11.3		-0.5		10.8
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
69	CIWS MODS		37.1				37.1
70	5"/54 GUN MOUNT MODS		14.1		-5.0		9.1
71	3"/50 GUN MOUNT MODS		0.7				0.7
72	MK 75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS		4.2		-1.0		3.2
73	MODS UNDER $900,000		2.0				2.0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
74	GUN SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1.2				1.2
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS		247.5		-9.0		238.5
76	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		166.6		0.0		166.6
	TOTAL, NAVY WEAPONS PROCUREMENT		5627.9		25.6		5653.5

TRIDENT I MISSILE

The administration requested $66.2 million in procurement funds for special flight test instrumentation and reentry system components for use in the Trident I (C-4) missile flight test program, and for ongoing weapon system support.

Due to budget constraints, the committee recommends without prejudice a $20 million reduction in Trident I procurement.

TOMAHAWK

The administration requested $68.8 million for research and development, and $670.2 million for the procurement of 249 Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missiles in fiscal year 1986. In addition, $45.2 million was requested for the procurement of initial spares, and $64.6 million was requested for advance procurement of future missiles.

The Tomahawk provides the United States Navy with a dispersed, flexible and survivable capability at sea to strike enemy targets at long ranges. Available in conventional anti-ship (TASM), and both conventional (TLAM-C) and nuclear (TLAM-N) land attack variants, the Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missile is designed for deployment on a wide range of naval platforms.

The committee continues to be satisfied with improvements in the management of the Tomahawk program, and commends the Navy for the very successful flight test program conducted to date. The Navy also met the initial operational capability for Tomahawk on submarines and surface combatants last summer.

In the past, the committee expressed its support for dual sourcing of the Tomahawk program as a means both to minimize costs and maintain product quality and reliability. The committee is pleased to note that the Navy has proceeded with a dual source procurement for Tomahawk, and supports this competitive approach. The committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for the Tomahawk program in fiscal year 1986, including funds for initial spares.

AIM-7M SPARROW

The administration requested $359.2 million for the procurement of 1,872 AIM-7M Sparrow missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1986 and $9.5 million in advance procurement funds for 1987.

The AIM-7M Sparrow missile is a joint Navy/Air Force medium-range, air-to-air, radar-guided missile. Inventory shortfalls of air-to-air missiles, particularly the radar guided Sparrow, have been identified by operational commanders as one of the most significant deficiencies in their warfighting posture.

The committee therefore recommends approval of the administration's request for Sparrow missiles.

AIM-9M SIDEWINDER

The administration requested $85.8 million for the procurement of 1,220 AIM-9M Sidewinder missiles for the Navy in fiscal year 1986 and $8.0 million in advance procurement funds for 1987.

The AIM-9M Sidewinder is a joint Navy/Air Force short-range, air-to-air missile with heat seeking (infra-red) guidance. The AIM-9M is the newest version of this very successful air-to-air missile. The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for the procurement of Sidewinder missiles.

AIM–54C PHOENIX MISSILE

The administration requested $343.6 million for the procurement of 265 AIM-54C Phoenix missiles in fiscal year 1986 and $38.3 million in advance procurement funds for fiscal year 1987.

The AIM-54C Phoenix is a supersonic, all weather, long-range air-to-air missile with semi-active midcourse guidance and an active terminal seeker. The AIM-54C incorporates advanced digital electronics and an improved target detector designed to enhance current operational capabilities.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Phoenix missiles.

AGM–84 HARPOON

The administration requested $314.9 million for the procurement of 395 AGM-84 Harpoon missiles.

The AGM-84 Harpoon is an air, surface, and submarine-launched anti-ship missile. The Harpoon is presently planned for use aboard the P-3, S-3, A-6, and F/A-18 aircraft as well as several surface combatants.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Harpoon missiles.

AGM–88 HARM (HIGH SPEED ANTI-RADIATION MISSILE)

The administration requested $258.0 million for the procurement of 904 High Speed Anti-Radiation Missiles (HARM) for the Navy. The HARM is a lethal defense suppression weapon designed to destroy enemy threat radars. It will be procured by both the Air Force and Navy.

Currently one of the most significant deficiencies in the capabilities of our tactical air forces is in the area of lethal defense suppression. The HARM missile, which is now being delivered to the fleet, will provide this essential capability. Initial reports from operational units receiving HARM have been uncommonly enthusiastic. They cite unprecedented levels of reliability and describe the missile's capabilities as being limited "only by the imagination".

The committee recommends authorization of the administration's request for HARM missiles.

STANDARD MISSILE

The Navy's SM-1 and SM-2 Standard Missiles are candidates for second-source production, according to testimony before the committee.

The committee encourages the Navy to second-source the Standard missiles, and all subordinate components, as quickly as possible.

Further, the committee continues to encourage the Navy to develop second-sources of production for all munitions and their components whenever appropriate.

AGM-65E LASER MAVERICK

The administration requested $194.3 million for the Marine Corps procurement of 1,500 AGM-65E missiles.

The AGM-65E Laser Maverick is a semi-active laser guided, air-to-ground missile designed for use against tanks, bunkers and port facilities. It is a short range, line of sight, day or night weapon for close air support, interdiction and strike missions against land and sea targets.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for Laser Maverick.

MARK-48 ADCAP TORPEDO

The administration requested $417.4 million for procurement of 123 Mark-48 ADCAP torpedoes.

This is an improved version of the Mark-48 torpedo carried on United States submarines, and is designed to defeat improved Soviet submarines.

The committee notes the procurement unit price of this weapon is $3.79 million in fiscal year 1985 and that this is projected to decline to a then-year price of $1.378 million in fiscal year 1990, when a higher procurement rate is also projected. The weapon is currently being procured using a cost plus incentive fee contract. The budget request did not discuss the Navy's plans to develop a second-source for this weapon or a different type of contract, but Navy witnesses indicated intent to second-source the MK-48 ADCAP in 1989.

The committee strongly urges the Navy to fund the development of a second prime contractor for this weapon beginning with fiscal year 1987. Should the fiscal 1987 request not include such a plan, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to provide a letter explaining his rationale to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than February 15, 1986.

The committee recommends authorization of $417.4 million for procurement of 123 MK-48 ADCAP torpedoes, as requested.

MK-46 TORPEDO

The administration requested $105.5 million for procurement of 500 MK-46 torpedoes and $23.6 million in advance procurement. A three-year multi-year procurement will be completed in fiscal year 1985 and the fiscal year 1986 request is for the first year of another three-year MYP.

The Mark-46 torpedo is the only in-service, lightweight torpedo, designed for launch from surface vessel tubes, ASROC, and fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft. It is an acoustically guided anti-submarine torpedo.

The previous multi-year procurement funded a production rate of 1500 per year. The current request is for only 500 annually. This lower rate will keep the production line open until the replacement MK-50 torpedo is approved for full production.

The committee recommends authorization of $105.5 million for procurement of 500 MK-46 torpedoes and $23.6 million in advance procurement as part of a multi-year procurement of this weapon.

MK-60 CAPTOR MINES

The MK-60 CAPTOR mine system is a moored, deepwater, influence activated anti-submarine warfare mine which launches an appropriately modified MK-46 torpedo against submerged submarines. The CAPTOR is the Navy's only deep water mine. The fiscal year 1986 budget request included no funds for the CAPTOR program, although there is an acknowledged shortfall in the CAPTOR inventory objective.

In light of this shortfall, the committee authorized $59.6 million for the procurement of 150 CAPTOR mines.

DEEP SEA MINES

The committee is concerned that the Navy has not adequately addressed its need for the CAPTOR mine. The committee expects that, as part of its fiscal year 1987 budget request, the Navy will identify and justify its operational needs for deep water mines, of which CAPTOR is the only operational system. If the operational requirements for CAPTOR are more than the number currently in the inventory, plus those in procurement, the Navy shall present a funding plan for procurement of the remainder.

The committee also expects that the Navy will address the effectiveness of the entire CAPTOR system and describe any plans for improvement during the life of the system.

SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS

The administration requested a total of $500,000 for 9mm handgun procurement for the Navy which, consistent with the discussion under Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, is denied.

NAVY REVIEW OF ACCOUNT CRITERIA

The presentation of funding for munitions in the Navy's budget is not consistent and should be changed.

The Navy's Weapons Procurement account (WPN) does not include all of the Navy's weapons. Naval gun ammunition, for example, is listed under Other Procurement (OPN). Sonobuoys are also carried under Other Procurement, although the Navy frequently discusses sonobuoys when briefing Congress on munition stockpiles. Moreover, the Weapons Procurement account includes items which may belong elsewhere, such as support equipment for fleet satellite communications.

Testimony before the committee indicated that programs currently in the WPN account were once part of a larger account funding missiles and aircraft. Evidently, since creation of the WPN account, the Navy has not thoroughly reviewed which programs logically belong in it.

The committee directs the Navy to review and revise its current listing of programs in the Weapons Procurement account. In the fiscal year 1987 budget request all expendable ordnance, including sonobuoys and countermeasures, should be funded in WPN.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS						
1	TRIDENT (NUCLEAR)	1	1547.7		-75.0	1	1472.7
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-264.1				-264.1
	NET		1283.6		-75.0		1208.6
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		248.2				248.2
	SUBTOTAL, FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS		1531.8		-75.0		1456.8
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
4	SSN-688 CLASS SUBMARINE (NUCLEAR)	4	2685.0		-60.0	4	2625.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-561.8				-561.8
	NET		2123.2		-60.0		2063.2
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		585.2				585.2
8	BATTLESHIP REACT ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		53.5				53.5
10	CV SLEP ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		133.4				133.4
11	CG-47 AEGIS CRUISER (MYP)	3	2787.3			3	2787.3
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-35.7				-35.7
	NET		2751.6				2751.6
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14.6				14.6
14	DDG-51 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		164.3				164.3
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS		5825.8		-60.0		5765.8
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
15	LSD-41 LANDING SHIP DOCK	2	497.9			2	497.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-83.5				-83.5
	NET		414.4				414.4
17	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP	1	1187.8			1	1187.8
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-39.2				-39.2
	NET		1148.6				1148.6
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		358.6		-193.0		165.6
	SUBTOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		1921.6		-193.0		1728.6
	MINE WARFARE & PATROL SHIPS						
22	MCM MINE COUNTERMEASURES SHIP	4	334.1	-2	-167.0	166	167.1
23	MSH-1 COASTAL MINE HUNTER	4	184.5			4	184.5
	SUBTOTAL, MINE WARFARE & PATROL SHIPS		518.6		-167.0		351.6

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT & PY PROG COSTS						
24	TAO FLEET OILER	2	328.5			2	328.5
25	TAGOS SURTASS SHIP	2	113.9			2	113.9
26	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1.2				1.2
28	AG SOUND BARGE	1	68.9		-3.9	1	65.0
29	MTSD		26.5				26.5
35	SERVICE CRAFT		79.5		-10.0		69.5
36	LANDING CRAFT		34.4		-5.0		29.4
37	STRATEGIC SEALIFT		203.4				203.4
38	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	12	307.5			12	307.5
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-31.3				-31.3
	NET		276.2				276.2
39	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30.8				30.8
40	OUTFITTING		228.5		-5.0		223.5
41	POST DELIVERY		112.6		-5.0		107.6
43	TACS CRANE SHIP (CONV)	3	82.5			3	82.5
44	TAVB (CONV)	1	32.1			1	32.1
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-5.2				-5.2
	NET		26.9				26.9
	SUBTOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT & PY PROG COSTS		1613.8		-28.9		1584.9
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-114.0		-114.0
	TOTAL, NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION		11411.6		-637.9		10773.7

The administration requested $11,411.6 million for the Navy shipbuilding and conversion program for fiscal year 1986. It provides for 28 ships, of which 23 are new construction and 5 are conversions.

The new construction ships included one OHIO class (TRIDENT) ballistic missile submarine, four SSN-688 (LOS ANGELES) class nuclear-powered attack submarines, three CG-47 (TICONDEROGA) class Aegis guided missile cruisers, two LSD-41 class dock landing ships, one LHD-1 class amphibious assault ship, four MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships, four MSH-1 class minesweeper-hunters, two TAO-187 class fleet oilers, and two TAGOS-1 class ocean surveillance ships. The conversions included one AG acoustic research vessel, three TACS auxiliary crane ships, and one TAVB aviation logistics support ship.

The SCN request includes long-lead funds for reactivation of the fourth battleship in fiscal year 1987, multi-year procurement of the one LHD and two others, and procurement of twelve LCAC air cushion landing craft.

Additionally, the program includes long-lead funding for future procurement of OHIO class submarines, SSN-688 class submarines, a fourth aircraft carrier service life extension (CV SLEP) in fiscal year 1987, and two DDG-51 class Aegis destroyers in fiscal year 1987. Long-lead funding is requested for future TAGOS ships and LCACs, as well as funds for the strategic sealift program, service life craft, landing craft, outfitting and post delivery.

In all, the shipbuilding and conversion request in fiscal 1986 is $172.9 million less than was appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends authorization of $10,773.7 million for the SCN program.

TRIDENT BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINE (SSBN)

The administration requested $1,283.6 million for the procurement of one Trident ballistic missile submarine, the thirteenth ship of the OHIO class. In addition, $248.2 million was requested in fiscal year 1986 for advance procurement relating to follow-on submarines.

The committee continues to attach a high priority to the modernization of the sea-based leg of the United States strategic triad. The Trident submarine, with its greater operating range, advanced quieting system, and modern long-range ballistic missiles, provides a significant and survivable enhancement to our strategic deterrent.

Over the past year, the committee has received a number of reprogramming actions reflecting downward repricing of Trident submarines approved in prior years. The Navy is to be commended for the success being achieved in price reductions in this, and in other areas of the shipbuilding account, ~~as well~~ as for the continued positive trends in Trident submarine construction delivery schedules.

As a result of budgetary considerations, the committee recommends without prejudice a reduction of $15.0 million in Trident related research and development, and a reduction in the procurement request for the Trident SSBN of $75 million. The committee believes that this amount of additional savings can be realized from the fiscal year 1985 and prior year Trident II configured submarines, and that these savings should be applied against the fiscal year 1986 submarine funding requirements, which the committee understands already reflect downward pricing adjustments.

LOS ANGELES (SSN–688) CLASS ATTACK SUBMARINES

The administration requested $2,123.2 million for procurement of four SSN-688 class nuclear-powered attack submarines and $585.2 million in long-lead funds for additional submarines. These would be the forty-ninth through fifty-second ships of this class.

The LOS ANGELES (SSN-688) class attack submarines are designed to destroy enemy surface ships and submarines while operating in direct support of United States forces or in a detached status. The SSN-688 weapons include MK-48 torpedoes and Harpoon and Tomahawk cruise missiles. After modification, this class will be capable of vertically launching cruise missiles from separate vertical launch system (VLS) cannisters located in the forward section of the submarine.

The committee supports the request for four nuclear-powered attack submarines. That a firm military requirement exists for building these ships was reconfirmed by the fleet commanders in testimony this year. The Soviet Union outnumbers the United States 3:1 in total submarines, including 197 nuclear powered ones. This represents 55 percent of the world total for nuclear-powered submarines. The Soviets are building 8 to 9 nuclear powered submarines annually. The United States force level goal of 100 SSNs requires construction of more than 3 submarines annually, but on average, fewer than 2 submarines per year were funded during the period 1976-1983.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,063.2 million for 4 SSN-688 class submarines, a reduction of $60 million, and $585.2 million in long lead funding for future submarines.

IOWA CLASS BATTLESHIP REACTIVATION

The administration requested $53.5 million in advance procurement for reactivation of the USS WISCONSIN (BB-64), the fourth of the four IOWA class battleships.

The committee fully supported the reactivation of the first three battleships. These battleships were placed in storage early in their useful service lives. The reactivation of the battleships includes the addition or reactivation of: nine 16-inch guns, twelve 5-inch guns, four Close-In Weapons Systems (Phalanx), eight armored box launchers for Tomahawk long-range cruise missiles (32 missiles per ship), and four quad cannisters for the Harpoon anti-ship missile (16 missiles). They will also be fitted with the AN/SLQ-32 electronic warfare system, SPS-49 air search radar, modernized communications, and an improved helicopter platform, as well as conversion to Navy distillate fuel and installation of the CHT sewage collection system.

The battleships will operate either as elements of carrier battle groups or amphibious groups, or, in areas of lesser threats, as the center of a surface action group together with appropriate ASW and AAW escorts, in support of national interests.

Thus far, each of the battleships has been reactivated within scheduled time and budgeted cost.

The committee strongly supports the reactivation of this effective class of ships. The committee recommends authorization of $53.5 million in long-lead funding for reactivation of the fourth battleship.

AIRCRAFT CARRIER SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM (CV SLEP)

The administration requested $133.4 million in long lead funding for the aircraft carrier service life extension program (CV SLEP).

The service life extension program will permit the Navy to extend the service life of aircraft carriers from 30 years to 45 years. The extension is accomplished through 28 months of shipyard work during which equipment, systems, and structures are repaired or replaced. The fourth carrier, the USS KITTY HAWK, is scheduled to enter the shipyard in fiscal year 1987.

The committee has supported service life extension for three previous aircraft carriers, as a cost-effective means of supporting naval force level objectives. The committee authorized long lead funding last year for the SLEP for a fourth aircraft carrier.

The committee asked the Navy this year to provide information confirming that service life extension for the fourth carrier is preferable to a less comprehensive overhaul, but did not receive a complete and timely response. The committee also seeks confirmation that the planned location for this SLEP is the most cost effective alternative.

The committee recommends authorization of $133.4 million for CV SLEP. The committee also has included bill language prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of more than $86.4 million of these funds until ninety days after the Secretary of the Navy certifies that, all relevant factors considered, a full SLEP at Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is more cost effective than alternative means for achieving the same service life extension of the USS KITTY HAWK at other naval shipyards. Certification should be provided in a letter to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CG–47 CLASS GUIDED MISSILE CRUISERS

The administration requested $2,751.6 million for procurement of three CG-47 class cruisers and $14.6 million for advance procurement. These would be the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth ships of this class.

The CG-47 class guided missile cruiser is based on the proven hull and propulsion equipment of the DD-963 class destroyers and employs many of the same weapon systems. Significant additions include the Aegis fixed, phased array, anti-air warfare radar system, the advanced SM-2 surface-to-air missile, and the vertical launch system on ships procured after fiscal year 1982.

The committee strongly supports the request for 3 CG-47 class Aegis cruisers. The Aegis combat system brings a new level of anti-air warfare capability to naval forces. The first ship of this class, the USS TICONDEROGA, performed very well during her first deployment to the Mediterranean Sea and during a later operational test and evaluation. Shock testing of the second ship, USS YORKTOWN, was very successful.

The Navy's acquisition plan for procuring these ships, at a rate of three per year, is sound and the competition between two building yards has reduced the basic construction cost of the hull by $100 million each during the last four years, in constant 1980 dollars.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,751.6 million for 3 CG-47 class cruisers and $14.6 million in long lead funding for additional ships of this class.

ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) CLASS GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYER

The administration requested $164.3 million for long lead funding of the ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class guided missile destroyers.

The DDG-51 guided missile destroyer is designed as a battle group capable, Aegis equipped, ASW capable destroyer to replace the aging inventory of DDG-2 class and DDG-37 class guided missile destroyers. The DDG-51 will be used as a battle group or surface action group escort and as an AAW/ASW leader of small escorts for protection of amphibious or logistic shipping. The DDG-51 will incorporate better sea-keeping design, a proven propulsion system, better battle protection and hardening, increased survivability, a clean low-profile design, and the first class-wide system for chemical and biological warfare protection.

The lead ship of this class was authorized last year, and fiscal 1986 provides the normal one year gap between funding for the lead ship of a class and the follow-on ships. This interval will permit lessons learned during construction to be incorporated in the follow-on units.

The committee recommends authorization of $164.3 million for long lead funding of two additional ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class guided missile destroyers.

The Navy awarded the contract for construction of the lead ship of the ARLEIGH BURKE (DDG-51) class guided missile destroyers on April 2, 1985. The committee has been informed the winning competitive bid for construction of this ship was lower than expected.

During the authorization hearings in fiscal year 1984, the committee asked whether the DDG-51 design should include full helicopter support facilities. Navy witnesses confirmed that such facilities would significantly enhance the ship's operational capabilities, but that full helicopter facilities had not been included because they would have increased the ship's cost above the established price ceiling.

Given that the DDG-51 may cost less than anticipated, the committee desires to re-examine the issue of helicopter support facilities for these ships.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to review options for including full helicopter support facilities in some or all of the DDG-51 class destroyers. As a lower cost option, the Secretary should also examine the feasibility of adding torpedo and sonobuoy helicopter rearming capability to the existing DDG-51 design. The

Secretary is to provide a detailed report with recommendations on the available options not later than January 15, 1986 to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

LSD–41 CLASS DOCK LANDING SHIP

The administration requested $414.4 million for the procurement of two LSD-41 class dock landing ships.

The LSD-41 class of amphibious ships is a replacement program for eight LSD-28 class ships scheduled to retire in the 1983-1989 period. The LSD-41 will transport and launch amphibious craft and vehicles with their crews and embarked personnel in amphibious assault operations. It will provide limited docking and repair services for conventional and air-cushion landing craft.

The committee has consistently supported procurement of LSD-41s as a vital program in an effort to augment inadequate amphibious lift capabilities. These two ships complete the Navy's procurement objective for LSD-41s.

The committee recommends authorization of $414.4 million for procurement of two LSD-41 class dock landing ships.

LHD–1 CLASS AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP

The administration requested $1,148.6 million for procurement of the second ship of the LHD-1 class of amphibious assault ships and $358.6 million in advance procurement.

The LHD-1 is an air-capable, amphibious assault ship based on the LHA-1 class ship design. In the amphibious role, the LHD-1 will be able to land Marine assault forces by helicopters, landing craft and amphibious vehicles. In addition to its amphibious lift capabilities, the LHD-1 will have the capability to support vertical/short take-off and landing (V/STOL) aircraft which will provide the fleet with additional offensive aviation forces afloat.

The administration's request includes sufficient funds to enter into a multi-year procurement contract for three LHD-1 class ships. Full funding is requested for LHD-2. The advance procurement money would fund government furnished equipment (GFE) and shipbuilder and subcontractor requirements (including advance planning, material procurement and prefabrication) for LHD-3 and LHD-4.

The committee acknowledges the need for the LHD-1 class ships and supports their procurement. The committee recognizes the appeal of a multi-year procurement plan, given the savings the Navy has realized with similar plans in the past.

Because of heightened competition and productivity within the shipbuilding industry, and innovative contracting techniques on the Navy's part, the committee is pleased to note the Navy is realizing substantial savings within the SCN budget. Ship contracts continue to be let at prices well below the administration's requests.

In anticipation of continued efforts by the Navy and shipbuilders to further reduce costs, the committee recommends authorization of $1,314.2 million for procurement of one LHD-1 class ship and advance procurement for two additional LHD-1 class ships, a reduction of $193 million. The committee recommends the Navy be authorized to solicit bids and contract with industry for a multi-year procurement of three LHD-1 class ships, provided that such a contract can be accommodated within the funds authorized for shipbuilding.

MCM–1 CLASS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SHIP

The administration requested $334.1 million for the procurement of four MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships in fiscal year 1986.

The MCM-1 class is designed to replace the older, obsolete MSO class of ocean minesweepers that are reaching the end of their useful service lives. The MCM-1 class will conduct mine clearance operations in concert with MCM helicopters in both shallow and deep water using sonar, various mechanical and influence mine sweeping equipment, and the new Precise Integrated Navigation System (PINS) and the Mine Neutralization System (MNS).

The committee recommends authorization of $167.1 million for the procurement of two MCM-1 class mine countermeasures ships, a reduction of two ships and $167.0 million.

MSH–1 MINESWEEPER-HUNTER

The administration requested $184.5 million for procurement of four MSH-1 class minesweeper-hunters in fiscal year 1986.

The MSH is a 189 foot, 434 ton, surface effect ship constructed of glass reinforced plastic (fiberglass) powered by low magnetic signature diesel engines. The selection of this hull form marks the Navy's first embrace of an innovative hull design in many years. The first ship of this class was funded in fiscal 1984 and these are the second through fifth ships of this class.

The committee recommends authorization of $184.5 million for procurement of four MSH-1 class ships, as requested.

TAO–187 CLASS FLEET OILERS

The administration requested $328.5 million for the procurement of two TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

The TAO-187 class fleet oiler is a 180,000 barrel capacity, twin screw, 20 knot, diesel-driven ship designed to operate as a unit of an Underway Replenishment (UNREP) group. The TAO-187 class will be operated and manned by the Military Sealift Command and will furnish petroleum products from shore depots to other support ships (AORs, AOEs, AOs and other TAOs) effecting delivery and consolidation underway. The ship delivers bulk petroleum products, and delivers and receives freight, mail and personnel. These ships are capable of replenishing combatants and support forces underway and in port. These are the eighth and ninth ships in a seventeen ship program. They will replace ships which are over 35 years of age.

The committee recommends authorization of $328.5 million for the procurement of two TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

TAO–187 CLASS FLEET OILER SECOND SOURCE

The committee notes that the Navy has agreed to establish a second source for construction of TAO-187 class fleet oilers.

The committee strongly reaffirms its support for this decision and advises that even if budget constraints require some adjustment to the procurement program this year, the Navy should continue forward with this approach.

ACOUSTIC RESEARCH VESSEL

The administration requested $68.9 million for conversion of one AG acoustic research vessel.

The AG program will convert an existing catamaran hull oceanographic ship (USNS HAYES/T-AGOR 16) to a mobile acoustic laboratory supporting a Military Sealift Command crew and 29 scientists. It will replace a sound barge over 40 years old which has a high radiated noise signature. The acoustic research vessel will transport, deploy and retrieve acoustic arrays, conduct acoustic measurements and perform acoustic testing in support of the Navy's submarine noise reduction program.

The committee recommends authorization of $65 million for conversion of one acoustic research vessel, a reduction of $3.9 million.

MOORED TRAINING SHIP DEMONSTRATION

The administration requested $26.5 million in long lead funding for conversion of an inactivated nuclear submarine into a nuclear reactor training platform for naval propulsion plant operators. It is the most cost efficient means to maintain the high standards of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program and ensures sufficient operating reactors will be available for training future plant operators.

The committee recommends authorization of $26.5 million for the Moored Training Ship Demonstration (conversion) program.

SERVICE CRAFT

The administration requested $79.5 million for service craft.

This would provide for two open lighters (YC), two floating cranes (YD), two covered lighters (YFN), six patrol craft (YP), and one covered lighter range tender (YFRT).

The commmittee recommends authorization of $69.5 million, which is a reduction of $10 million.

LANDING CRAFT

The administration requested $34.4 million for landing craft.

This would procure three Special Warfare Craft Medium (SWCM), designed to transport, support, insert, extract and defend special warfare elements.

The committee recommends authorization of $29.9 million, which is a reduction of $5 million.

STRATEGIC SEALIFT READY RESERVE FORCE (RRF)

The administration requested $203.4 million for continued acquisition of commercial ships for the Ready Reserve Force (RRF). This program was initiated in fiscal year 1984. The ships to be acquired are currently in the inventory of United States-flag commercial ships and are suitable for military support operations.

The RRF, a subset of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, provides timely sealift capability to promptly load and transport those forces that may be expected to be deployed in a contingency or reinforcement scenario.

The committee strongly supports programs to augment strategic sealift capabilities and is pleased with the rapid progress made in expanding the RRF. This year's program will take advantage of the currently favorable market for purchase of sealift vessels.

The committee recommends authorization of $203.4 million in fiscal year 1986 for acquisition of commercial ships for the RRF. Given the priority the committee attaches to increasing sealift capacity, undistributed reductions in the SCN account should not be applied against the Strategic Sealift Program.

LANDING CRAFT, AIR CUSHION (LCAC)

The administration requested $276.2 million for procurement of 12 LCACs in fiscal year 1986 and $30.8 million in advance procurement for 12 LCACs in fiscal year 1987.

The LCAC is an air cushion landing craft that will permit high-speed amphibious assaults over extended distances. It will greatly increase worldwide beach areas over which assaults may be conducted.

The committee recommends authorization of $276.2 million in fiscal year 1986 for procurement of 12 LCACs and $30.8 million in advance procurement for 12 LCACs in fiscal year 1987.

OUTFITTING

The administration requested $228.5 million for outfitting.

Outfitting material consists of government furnished repair parts and other material required to fill a ship's initial allowance of storeroom and operating space items, upon completion of construction or conversion.

The committee recommends authorization of $223.5 million for outfitting, a reduction of $5 million.

POST DELIVERY

The administration requested $112.6 million for post delivery.

Post delivery includes the design, planning, government furnished material, and related labor costs required to correct ship deficiencies defined during acceptance and shakedown trials. It is limited to the work which can be accomplished within eleven months following completion of Fitting-Out. All funds required for correction of deficiencies for a particular ship are budgeted in the first fiscal year in which funding is required.

The committee recommends authorization of $107.6 million for post delivery, which is a reduction of $5 million.

TACS CLASS AUXILIARY CRANE SHIP

The administration requested $82.5 million for the conversion of three containerships to TACS class auxiliary crane ships.

The TACS program involves the conversion of selected containerships of the Maritime Administration Ready Reserve Fleet (RRF) through the installation of cranes, supplementary crew accommodations, and enhanced breakbulk cargo storage. The ships, with their permanently installed heavy-lift cranes, will be capable of self-unloading heavy cargo and unloading non-self-sustaining containerships and other ships alongside. The TACS ships will be maintained in a high degree of readiness in an inactive status in the continental United States or stationed in a forward area. When activated, the ships will be crewed by merchant seamen and will be operated by the Military Sealift Command (MSC).

These crane ships fill a critical role in the military use of container ships. Without the necessary equipment for transporting cargo from ship to shore, critical bottlenecks could develop in logistic support of military operations. The first two TACS ships were converted using O&M,N and OPN funding. The ships in this year's request are the fourth through sixth of a ten ship program.

The committee recommends authorization of $82.5 million for the conversion of three containerships into TACS class auxiliary crane ships.

TAVB CLASS AVIATION LOGISTICS SUPPORT SHIP

The administration requested $26.9 million for the conversion of one Government-owned SEABRIDGE class (C5-S-78A) combination roll-on/roll-off (RO/RO) and self-sustaining containership into a TAVB in fiscal year 1986.

The TAVB class aviation logistics support ship will support Intermediate Maintenance Activity (IMA) vans in transit and upon arrival theater in support of the rapid deployment of United States Marine Corps aircraft. These ships will also be capable of conducting a resupply role upon the movement ashore of the IMA equipment. Advance procurement funds were provided last year for this conversion.

The committee strongly supports the TAVB class aviation logistics support ship program and recommends authorization of $26.9 million for the conversion of one combination RO/RO and self-sustaining containership to the TAVB configuration, which will complete the Navy's inventory objective of two.

FAST COMBAT SUPPORT SHIP (AOE)

The Navy's shipbuilding plan for fiscal year 1987 includes one AOE fast combat support ship. The AOE would deliver munitions, bulk petroleum products, and dry and frozen provisions to battle groups underway in hostile environments.

The committee notes this lead ship AOE represents an auxiliary ship at a price of three-quarters of a billion dollars, substantially more costly than a LOS ANGELES (SSN-688) class attack submarine. The committee also notes that this ship was once planned for inclusion in the fiscal year 1986 request.

The committee urges the Navy to use all possible methods to reduce the cost of this AOE, including greater use of commercial specifications. Unless the cost of the AOE is significantly reduced, it may be unaffordable.

AEGIS SECOND SOURCE

The committee is pleased with the Navy's progress in developing competitive sources of supply for equipment which was formerly sole-sourced. The Navy's achievements, for example, in second-sourcing the Aegis cruiser hull have reduced basic construction costs by $100 million per ship, measured in constant dollars since fiscal 1980. This financial success was even greater than expected, and, with that perspective, the committee urges the Navy to redouble its efforts to compete the Aegis combat system.

The Navy's current plan calls for competition of Aegis system integration in 1989. Meanwhile, the Navy intends to develop second sources for selected componts. The Navy wants to maintain a high level of quality control during the manufacture and testing of the Aegis combat system prior to installation during ship construction, and the committee supports this goal.

However, the committee observes the Navy has not selected a second source to compete with the prime contractor, nor did it identify specific funds in either the RDT&E or SCN accounts to support the development of a second source for the Aegis combat system.

The committee strongly urges the Navy to accelerate the introduction of a competitive second source for supply of the Aegis combat system.

SHIP DESIGN

All ship design is currently funded in the Navy's RDT&E account, even though some design work is essential to implement the Navy's SCN program. It is inappropriate to fund such activity in the research and development account.

The committee desires that ship design work which is necessary for the procurement of ships in the five-year plan be funded in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account, beginning in fiscal 1987. Appropriate bill language has been included.

CONSTRUCTION OF FOREIGN-DESIGNED DIESEL-ELECTRIC SUBMARINES IN AMERICAN SHIPYARDS

Last year, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to report by October 1, 1984 on the procedures required to permit allied or friendly nations to build diesel-electric submarines in American shipyards, provided certain conditions were met. Six months after the deadline, the committee has still not received the required report.

This is a timely issue and the report is needed to clarify some of the complex considerations involved. Accordingly, the committee has included bill language which prohibits the obligation or expenditure of any funds authorized for the fiscal year 1986 Navy shipbuilding and conversion program until the final report requested last year is properly submitted to the committee.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		13.3				13.3
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	2	15.5			2	15.5
3	LM2500 SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		0.9				0.9
4	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		6.8				6.8
5	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		19.9				19.9
	GENERATORS						
7	OTHER GENERATORS		16.0				16.0
	PUMPS						
8	OTHER PUMPS		11.6				11.6
	AIR COMPRESSORS						
9	HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSOR	12	3.3			12	3.3
	PROPELLERS						
11	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	15	3.0			15	3.0
12	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS		11.5				11.5
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
13	ELECTRICALLY SUSPENDED GYRO NAVIGATOR	8	36.8			8	36.8
14	CARRIER NAVIGATION SYSTEM		9.5				9.5
15	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		16.1				16.1
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
16	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT		8.5				8.5
	PERISCOPES						
17	TYPE 18 PERISCOPE		16.2				16.2
18	TYPE 8 PERISCOPES		0.1				0.1
19	PERISCOPES AND ACCESSORIES		5.4				5.4
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
20	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		5.1				5.1
21	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARDS	12	10.6			12	10.6
22	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		9.3				9.3
23	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT		18.0				18.0
24	SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT		3.4				3.4
25	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	37	8.3			37	8.3
26	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56.5				56.5
27	DSSP EQUIPMENT		11.3				11.3

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
28	SEALIFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		59.0				59.0
30	MINESWEEPING CABLE		5.7				5.7
31	HM+E ITEMS UNDER 900K		10.8				10.8
32	SURFACE IMA		7.0				7.0
33	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS		2.3				2.3
34	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR		1.0				1.0
35	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	302	15.4			302	15.4
36	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	4	13.4			4	13.4
37	HM&E ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE		8.4				8.4
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
39	REACTOR POWER UNITS	6	163.4			6	163.4
40	REACTOR COMPONENTS		227.8				227.8
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
41	MAN IN THE SEA		0.9				0.9
42	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		8.3				8.3
43	NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT		30.8				30.8
	SMALL BOATS						
44	SMALL BOATS	251	14.8			251	14.8
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
46	NEW SHIPS TRAINING EQUIP		19.6				19.6
47	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		10.9				10.9
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
48	CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT		1.1				1.1
49	PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES		5.8				5.8
	SUBTOTAL, SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT		923.0		0.0		923.0
	COMMUNICATONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
52	AN/SPS-67	23	9.2			23	9.2
53	AN/SPS-40		14.8				14.8
54	AN/SPS-48		67.5				67.5
55	AN/SPS-49		14.1				14.1
56	AN/SYS-( )	7	13.1			7	13.1
57	MK 23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM	3	19.9			3	19.9
58	RADAR SUPPORT		25.0				25.0
	SHIP SONARS						
59	AN/SQS-26/53/53A		7.9				7.9
60	AN/SQS-53B	5	30.9			5	30.9
62	AN/BQQ-5		101.0				101.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
63	TB-16 TOWED ARRAY (MYP)	9	2.9			9	2.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-1.4				-1.4
	NET		1.5				1.5
65	SURF SONAR WINDOWS AND DOMES		8.5				8.5
66	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11.8				11.8
67	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		40.3				40.3
68	FBM SYSTEM SONARS		13.4				13.4
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
70	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEMS		10.4				10.4
71	AN/SLQ-25 (NIXIE)	44	11.5			44	11.5
72	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS		0.4				0.4
73	SUBMARINE ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEM		2.8				2.8
74	SOSUS		85.8				85.8
75	AN/SQR-17 ACOUSTIC PROCESSOR	20	15.2			20	15.2
76	AN/SQR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR		41.7				41.7
77	AN/SQR-15 TOWED ARRAY SONAR		1.9				1.9
78	AN/SQR-19 TOWED ARRAY SONAR	16	146.5			16	146.5
79	SURTASS		19.4				19.4
80	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER		30.0				30.0
81	CARRIER ASW MODULE		31.5				31.5
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
82	AN/SLQ-32		102.4				102.4
83	AN/SLQ-17		14.2				14.2
84	AN/WLR-1		3.5				3.5
85	AN/WLR-8	1	3.0			1	3.0
86	ICAD SYSTEMS		4.8				4.8
87	OFFBOARD DECEPTION DEVICES		22.2				22.2
88	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		21.5				21.5
89	FLEET EW SUPPORT GROUP		1.7				1.7
90	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		8.5				8.5
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
91	COMBAT CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT CONSOLE		4.0				4.0
92	COMBAT DF		25.1				25.1
93	OUTBOARD		36.4				36.4
94	NAVAL INTELLIGENCE PROCESSING SYSTEM		15.6				15.6
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
95	AN/WLQ-4 DEPOT		5.4				5.4
96	AN/WLQ-4 IMPROVEMENTS		2.5				2.5
97	AN/BRD-7/8/9	4	12.8			4	12.8
100	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROGRAM		4.5				4.5
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
101	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		130.9				130.9
102	TACTICAL FLAG COMMAND CENTER	4	20.8			4	20.8

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
104	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		3.5				3.5
106	OMEGA SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	44	1.6			44	1.6
107	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS	62	24.8	-30	-10.0	32	14.8
108	HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS	14	3.9			14	3.9
109	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		6.9				6.9
110	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		193.8				193.8
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
111	OTHER NAVELEX TRAINING EQUIPMENT		0.1				0.1
112	OTHER NAVSEA TRAINING EQUIPMENT		4.6				4.6
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
113	MATCALS		16.3				16.3
115	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		13.3				13.3
116	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEMS		9.2				9.2
117	TACAN		4.8				4.8
118	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12.2				12.2
119	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	14	7.4			14	7.4
120	FACSFAC		49.3		-10.0		39.3
121	RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	10	1.5			10	1.5
122	MK XII AIMS IFF		2.7				2.7
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
125	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		3.1				3.1
126	SPACE SYSTEM PROCESSING		2.1				2.1
127	MULTOTS		0.6				0.6
128	MCCS ASHORE		35.0				35.0
129	RADIAC		8.6				8.6
131	REMOTE SENSORS		1.6				1.6
132	GPETE		28.6				28.6
133	INTEG COMBAT SYS TEST FACILITY		5.3				5.3
134	CALIBRATION STANDARDS		7.0				7.0
135	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		10.0				10.0
136	SHORE ELECTRONIC ITEMS UNDER 900K		5.1				5.1
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
137	SHIPBOARD HF COMMUNICATIONS		13.6				13.6
138	SHIPBOARD UHF COMMUNICATIONS		7.3				7.3
139	FLIGHT DECK COMMUNICATIONS		6.2				6.2
140	PORTABLE RADIOS	271	3.7			271	3.7
141	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		16.0				16.0
142	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $900K		7.7				7.7
143	SEALIFT SHIP COMMUNICATIONS		4.8				4.8
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
144	ELF COMMUNICATIONS	34	13.2			34	13.2
145	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS		19.3				19.3
146	VERDIN		16.1				16.1
147	SSN INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS		1.7				1.7
149	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS ANTENNAS		15.5				15.5
150	DATA COLLECTION AND RECORD SYSTEM	25	1.0			25	1.0
151	CIRCUIT MAYFLOWER		0.3				0.3

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
152	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS		46.2				46.2
153	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS		22.9				22.9
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
154	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		1.4				1.4
155	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		0.1				0.1
156	SHORE HF COMMUNICATIONS		30.0				30.0
158	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS (TRI-TAC)		26.7				26.7
160	ASHORE MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS VANS	4	6.0			4	6.0
161	WORLDWIDE WIDEBAND COMMUNICATIONS		2.1				2.1
162	DEFENSE DATA NETWORK		2.8				2.8
163	WWMCCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		1.1				1.1
164	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		9.9				9.9
165	SHORE COMM ITEMS UNDER 900K		3.1				3.1
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
166	SINGLE AUDIO SYSTEM		18.2				18.2
167	TSEC/KY-71/72 (STU-II/STU-IIM)		15.8				15.8
168	TSEC/KG-84		27.1				27.1
169	TSEC/KY-57/58 (VINSON)		25.0				25.0
171	TSEC/KYV-5 (ANDVT)		4.6				4.6
172	TSEC/KW-46		14.3				14.3
173	TSEC/KG-72/KGV-14 (FDCS)		1.4				1.4
174	TSEC/KG-81 (WALBURN)		5.3				5.3
175	TSEC/KG-44 (DMSP)		7.9				7.9
177	TSEC/KG-58/KGV-6 (PLRS)		9.5				9.5
178	TRI-TAC CRYPTO (TENLEY)		11.9				11.9
179	TSEC/KY-67 (BANCROFT)		13.5				13.5
180	TSEC/KGV-11		4.5				4.5
181	COMMON FILL DEVICES		2.0				2.0
182	SIGNAL SECURITY		1.9				1.9
183	CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER 900K		5.5				5.5
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
186	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		4.9				4.9
187	SHIPS SIGNAL EXPLOITATION SPACE		4.8				4.8
188	CRYPTOLOGIC ITEMS UNDER 900K		6.0				6.0
189	CRYPTOLOGIC RESERVES EQUIPMENT		0.8				0.8
190	CRYPTOLOGIC FIELD TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2.1				2.1
191	SHORE CRYPTOLOGIC SUPPORT SYSTEM		2.3				2.3
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
192	ADVANCE BASE FUNCTIONAL COMPONENTS		0.1				0.1
193	ELEC ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE (NAVSEA)		5.3				5.3
194	ELEC ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE (NAVELEX)		2.1				2.1
---	9TH BATTALION C&E EQUIPMENT		0.0		2.0		2.0
	SUBTOTAL, COMM & ELEC EQUIPMENT		2154.0		-18.0		2136.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
196	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	31600	4.4			31600	4.4
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-2.0				-2.0
			--------				--------
	NET		2.4				2.4
198	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)		143.0				143.0
199	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)		3.1				3.1
200	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)		27.0				27.0
202	AN/SSQ-77 (VLAD)		82.1				82.1
204	AN/SSQ-86 (DLC)		3.0				3.0
205	SIGNAL UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)		1.4				1.4
207	LOW COST SONOBOUY		11.1				11.1
	AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE						
208	SKIPPER	925	27.6			925	27.6
209	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		148.6				148.6
210	LASER GUIDED BOMB KITS	652	22.1			652	22.1
211	WALLEYE		37.6				37.6
212	ROCKEYE	2090	8.8			2090	8.8
213	ZUNI ROCKET		20.7				20.7
214	2.75 INCH ROCKET		28.0				28.0
215	PARACHUTE FLARES	307	2.1			307	2.1
216	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		27.0				27.0
217	PRACTICE BOMBS		76.5		-10.0		66.5
218	CARTRIDGES + CARTRIDGE ACTUATED DEVICES		29.9				29.9
219	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		8.1				8.1
220	AIRBORNE EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		91.7		-15.0		76.7
221	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS		7.8				7.8
222	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		2.2				2.2
223	BIGEYE CHEMICAL WEAPON	425	21.5			425	21.5
224	JATOS		15.6				15.6
225	GATOR	1380	44.7			1380	44.7
226	MISC AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE		0.2				0.2
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
227	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		85.9		-8.0		77.9
229	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		2.9				2.9
230	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		79.0		-20.0		59.0
231	CATAPULTS AND ARRESTING GEAR		27.5				27.5
233	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		2.4				2.4
234	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		1.7				1.7
235	MISC SURVIVAL EQUIPMENT		17.7				17.7
236	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		23.0				23.0
237	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		42.7				42.7
238	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		2.4				2.4
239	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		2.3				2.3
240	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3.1				3.1
	ROUNDING ADJUSTMENT		-0.1				-0.1
	SUBTOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1184.0		-53.0		1131.0

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN AMMUNITION						
243	5 /38 GUN AMMUNITION		4.5				4.5
244	5 /54 GUN AMMUNITION		67.0				67.0
245	5 INCH GUIDED PROJECTILE		104.3				104.3
246	16 INCH GUN AMMUNITION		7.9				7.9
247	CIWS AMMUNITION		35.2				35.2
248	76MM GUN AMMUNITION		17.3				17.3
249	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		18.4				18.4
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
250	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		34.8				34.8
252	COAST GUARD GUN SYSTEM	3	28.8			3	28.8
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
253	MK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		2.9				2.9
254	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13.0				13.0
255	TERRIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		112.1				112.1
256	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		106.8				106.8
257	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (MYP)		43.8				43.8
258	AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM		1.0				1.0
260	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		61.8				61.8
261	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		86.6				86.6
262	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		19.0				19.0
263	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEM	3	127.4			3	127.4
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
264	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		168.9				168.9
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
266	MK 117 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		60.0				60.0
267	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25.7				25.7
268	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20.8				20.8
269	MK 116 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	8	25.7			8	25.7
270	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7.0				7.0
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
271	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		11.0				11.0
272	SWIMMER WEAPONS SYSTEMS		1.2				1.2
273	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET		7.8				7.8
274	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEMS	5	4.6			5	4.6
275	CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT		3.3				3.3
276	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		2.1				2.1
279	OTHER ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		1.5				1.5
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
281	SMALL ARMS AND LANDING PARTY AMMO		18.8				18.8

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
282	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION MATERIAL		25.5				25.5
283	QUICKSTRIKE		50.5				50.5
284	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25.2				25.2
285	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES		3.2				3.2
286	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		7.9				7.9
287	SHIPBOARD EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		33.2				33.2
	SUBTOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1396.5		0.0		1396.5
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
289	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	804	10.1			804	10.1
290	ARMORED SEDANS	1	0.1			1	0.1
291	TRUCKS	2775	38.1			2775	38.1
292	TRAILERS	271	4.0			271	4.0
293	CRUSH, MIX, BATCH, PAVE EQUIPMENT		4.7				4.7
294	DRILLING AND BLASTING EQUIPMENT		2.7				2.7
295	EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT	228	11.4			228	11.4
296	LIGHTING AND POWER GENERATING EQUIP		3.5				3.5
297	MISC CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE EQUIP		3.5				3.5
298	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	71	7.1			71	7.1
299	WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT	80	13.2			80	13.2
300	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		73.0				73.0
301	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9.5				9.5
303	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2.9				2.9
306	FLEET MOORINGS		7.3				7.3
307	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		2.7				2.7
310	FLEET HOSPITALS	1	27.7			1	27.7
---	9TH BATTALION EQUIPMENT		0.0		11.0		11.0
	SUBTOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPP EQUIPMENT		221.6		11.0		232.6
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
312	FORKLIFT TRUCKS	217	9.1			217	9.1
313	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		3.3				3.3
314	AUTOMATED MATERIALS HANDLING SYSTEMS		12.9				12.9
316	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		2.3				2.3
322	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		34.9				34.9
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		62.5		0.0		62.5
	PERSONNEL AND COMM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
325	SURFACE SONAR TRAINERS		40.5				40.5
327	SUBMARINE SONAR TRAINERS		6.9				6.9
328	SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS		23.7				23.7
329	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS		11.9				11.9
331	SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS		15.3				15.3
342	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIP		2.4				2.4
343	TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS		6.7				6.7

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
346	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17.2				17.2
347	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56.9		-3.9		53.0
348	ITEMS UNDER 900K		1.2				1.2
351	OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		0.0		14.0		14.0
352	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		17.2				17.2
	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM						
353	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM		176.5				176.5
	PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS						
356	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUND (PIF)		3.4				3.4
	SUBTOTAL, PERSONNEL & COMM SUPP EQUIPMENT		379.8		10.1		389.9
358	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		279.8		0.0		279.8
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-666.6		-666.6
	ROUNDING ADJUSTMENT		0.1				0.1
	TOTAL, NAVY OTHER PROCUREMENT		6601.2		-716.5		5884.7

UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH

The Unit Level Circuit Switch (ULCS) is an element of the TRI-TAC communications program which will be employed by each of the services. The ULCS consists of the AN/TTC-42 and SB-3865 switches. While the Marine Corps has been developing the ULCS, the Army and Air Force also plan to procure this equipment.

Operational testing during the spring of 1984 revealed reliability and maintainability deficiencies within the system. The Marine Corps Operational Test and Evaluation Activity (MCOTEA) recommended that the system not be approved for production and service use. The contractor subsequently conducted tests demonstrating substantial improvements in ULCS. The Marine Corps then directed that a Limited Operational Test (LOT) be conducted during January and February of this year.

The committee has learned that the Marine Corps Operational Test and Evaluation Activity has again recommended that the full ULCS system not be approved for full scale production. While the SB-3865 switch performed to standards, the TTC-42 switch did not. The MCOTEA report concludes "sufficient improvements in performance have not been demonstrated by the LOT to provide confidence that the ULCS, as a two-switch family, is ready for approval for service use and production."

The Marine Corps Acquisition Review Council will meet in April to determine whether to accept MCOTEA's recommendation. Since the ULCS has had significant development problems, the committee does not believe that an unqualified authorization to proceed at this time is warranted. Therefore, the committee directs that if the Marine Corps decides to proceed with ULCS, none of the funds provided pursuant to this authorization shall be obligated by either the Marine Corps or the Army until 30 days after the Marine Corps submits a report to the committee justifying the decision to proceed with the ULCS. That report should specifically address the recommendations of MCOTEA.

CIVIL ENGINEER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT FOR NAVAL CONSTRUCTION FORCE

The committee recognizes that in order to establish a 9th Naval Mobile Construction Battalion in fiscal year 1985, the Navy must procure Civil Engineering Support Equipment for the battalion. To minimize the impact of this requirement on the ongoing replacement program, the committee recommends $11,000,000 be added to the Other Procurement Navy account to procure Civil Engineering Support Equipment for the active Naval Construction Force. In addition, to ensure the 9th Naval Mobile Construction Battalion is provided adequate communications equipment, the committee recommends an addition of $2,000,000 to the Other Procurement Navy account for communications and electronic equipment.

OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT

The Navy's Other Procurement budget request included no funds for the Oceanographic Support Equipment program (line 351).

The committee recommends that a minimum of $14,000,000 in funds provided for other procurement items in the Navy be used for oceanography equipment such as gravity meters, acoustic buoy recorders/readout equipment, and an underwater television.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction to the Navy Other Procurement account in the amount of $666.6 million, to meet overall fiscal constraints. None of this reduction may be applied against sonobuoys (lines 196-207) or gun ammunition (lines 242-249).

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AMMUNITION						
1	LINEAR CHARGES (ALL TYPES)		3.2				3.2
2	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		9.6				9.6
3	MACHINE GUN AMMO (ALL TYPES)		34.9				34.9
4	MORTAR AMMUNITION (ALL TYPES)		33.3				33.3
5	GRENADES (ALL TYPES)		2.2				2.2
6	ROCKETS (ALL TYPES)		57.2				57.2
7	TRAINING AMMUNITION		29.0				29.0
8	155MM AMMUNITION		214.6				214.6
10	COPPERHEAD, 155MM PROJ		52.1				52.1
11	8 INCH AMMUNITION		11.2				11.2
12	FUZES (ALL TYPES)		31.3				31.3
13	AMMO MODERNIZATION		5.7				5.7
	OTHER SUPPORT						
14	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		4.5				4.5
	SUBTOTAL, AMMUNITION		488.9		0.0		488.9
	WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
21	MODIFICATION KITS		1.1				1.1
22	M60 MINE PLOW	80	4.4			80	4.4
23	RECOVERY VEHICLE	5	4.5			5	4.5
24	ARMORED VEHICLE LAUNCHED BRIDGE	16	8.6			16	8.6
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		1.5				1.5
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
26	BATTERY COMPUTER SYSTEM AN/GYK-29	166	32.3			166	32.3
27	M198 HOWITZER, MEDIUM, TOWED 155MM	35	21.0	-35	-21.0	0	0.0
30	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		1.9				1.9
	WEAPONS						
32	PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON (9MM)	10000	3.0		-3.0	10000	0.0
33	MACHINE GUN, LIGHT, SQUAD, AUTO. (SAW)	1000	3.3			1000	3.3
34	M16A2 RIFLE 5.56MM	28186	14.1			28186	14.1
35	MK-19 MACHINE GUN, 40MM	150	1.0			150	1.0
36	EOD EQUIPMENT		0.7				0.7
38	83MM LAUNCHER ASSAULT ROCKET (SMAW)	535	4.7			535	4.7
	SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		102.1		-24.0		78.1
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	GUIDED MISSILES						
39	HAWK	550	140.0			550	140.0
40	HAWK MOD		39.1				39.1
41	STINGER	800	59.4			800	59.4
42	TOW	4782	44.5			4782	44.5
	OTHER SUPPORT						
44	MODIFICATION KITS		0.7				0.7
	SUBTOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		283.7		0.0		283.7
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS						
45	MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT		12.7				12.7
46	VEHICLE MTD RADIOS AND EQUIP		10.6				10.6
	TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT						
48	UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH(ULCS)		18.6				18.6
49	ULCS LIFE CYCLE SUPPORT		17.1				17.1
50	AN/TGC-( ) TACTICAL COMM CENTER		4.0				4.0
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
55	AN/USM-323 ELECTRONIC GENERATOR SIGNAL	456	5.6			456	5.6
56	SHOP SETS ELECTRONIC	80	5.3			80	5.3
57	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT SYSTEM	45	5.2			45	5.2
60	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT		1.0				1.0
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT						
61	PP-7333 POWER SUPPLY	1012	3.8			1012	3.8
63	AN/GXC-7A FACSIMILE SET	359	6.7			359	6.7
64	ANDVT/TACTERM	34	1.5			34	1.5
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
66	TEST CALIBRATION AND MAINT SUPPORT		1.0				1.0
68	MODIFICATION KITS		3.6				3.6
69	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.9				0.9
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS (NON-TEL)						
70	POSITION LOCATION REPORTING SYS(PLRS)	2	59.1			2	59.1
72	TACTICAL AIR OPS MODULE (TAOM)	4	86.3		-23.0	4	63.3
	RADAR AND EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
75	AN/TPS-59 DECOY	5	9.1			5	9.1
76	AN/PPN-19 RADAR TRANSPONDER BEACON	272	13.2			272	13.2
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
80	REMOTE SENSOR EQUIPMENT		0.7				0.7
81	AN/TMQ-31 METEROLOGICAL DATA SYSTEM (MDS	9	13.3			9	13.3

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
88	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT		1.0				1.0
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
93	AN/TAS-4 NIGHT VISION SIGHT (TOW)		10.5				10.5
94	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT		0.5				0.5
95	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT		15.0				15.0
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
96	TEST CALIBRATION AND MAINT SUPPORT		1.6				1.6
98	MODIFICATION KITS		8.4				8.4
99	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.4				0.4
	SUBTOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS		316.6		-23.0		293.6
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
100	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	203	2.7			203	2.7
101	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		21.1				21.1
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
102	HIGH MOB MULTI-WHEELED VEH(HMMWV)(MYP)	4832	121.7			4832	121.7
103	AIR/CRASH FIRE & RESCUE VEH	6	1.0			6	1.0
105	TRUCKS, 5-TON (ALL TYPES)	396	39.7			396	39.7
106	5 TON RETROFIT	691	17.9			691	17.9
108	LOGISTICAL VEHICLE SYSTEM(LVS)	719	71.4			719	71.4
109	TRAILERS (ALL TYPES)	772	10.5			772	10.5
110	LUBRICATING AND SERVICING UNIT POWER	70	2.0			70	2.0
	OTHER SUPPORT						
112	MODIFICATION KITS		4.3				4.3
113	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		1.4				1.4
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES		293.8		0.0		293.8
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
116	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP		2.7				2.7
121	MOTORIZED ROAD GRADER	100	8.4			100	8.4
122	TRACTORS (ALL TYPES)	202	20.6			202	20.6
123	RUNWAY SWEEPER, VACUUM	18	2.3			18	2.3
124	SHOP EQUIP, GEN PUR, REPAIR, SEMI-TRLR	8	1.7			8	1.7
125	CONTAINER HANDLER, RT 50,0000LB.	27	7.7			27	7.7
126	CH-53E HELICOPTER SLING	310	1.0			310	1.0
127	FORKLIFTS (ALL TYPES)	225	11.1			225	11.1
129	BATH SHOWER UNIT EXPEDITIONARY FIELD	100	2.3			100	2.3
130	REFRIGERATION UNIT, F/RIGID BOX	264	1.2			264	1.2
131	REFRIGERATOR, RIGID BOX	218	1.4			218	1.4

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
133	WATER PURIFICATION UNIT - REV OSMOSIS	125	20.6			125	20.6
137	FUEL, WATER, PUMP AND STORAGE MODULE		4.2				4.2
138	FUEL SYS AMPHB ASSAULT 60,000 GAL	5	5.9			5	5.9
139	HELICOPTER EXPEDIENT REFUELING SYSTEM	6	0.7			6	0.7
142	BOAT, BRIDGE ERECTION	21	5.2			21	5.2
143	MEDIUM GIRDER BRIDGE	17	11.1			17	11.1
144	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		8.5				8.5
145	ELECTRICAL POWER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	17	9.0			17	9.0
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
146	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		0.8				0.8
148	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIP		6.3				6.3
149	TELEPHONE SYSTEM		4.3				4.3
152	MATERIEL HANDLING EQUIPMENT		1.5				1.5
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
153	TRN DEVICES (AUDIO VISUAL)		1.6				1.6
154	TRN DEVICES (SIMULATORS)		10.4				10.4
156	SHELTER FAMILY	870	17.6			870	17.6
157	CONTAINER FAMILY	4900	7.0			4900	7.0
158	CHEMICAL ALARM SYSTEM	634	1.9			634	1.9
159	DECONTAMINATING APPARATUS	85	1.2			85	1.2
160	SANITATION SET, FIELD KITCHEN	75	1.2			75	1.2
	OTHER SUPPORT						
162	MODIFICATION KITS		2.8				2.8
163	ITEMS LESS THAN 900,000		3.5				3.5
	SUBTOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		185.5		0.0		185.5
164	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		56.1		0.0		56.1
	TOTAL, MARINE CORPS PROCUREMENT		1726.8		-47.0		1679.8

M-198 HOWITZER, MEDIUM, TOWED 155MM

The administration requested $21 million for the procurement of 35 M-198 Howitzers for the Marine Corps. The Army also has a requirement for the procurement of M-198 Howitzers, however, no funds were requested in fiscal year 1986 for the procurement of Army M-198s.

The Army has proposed to procure 79 M-198 Howitzers in fiscal year 1987 at a cost of $43.7 million. The committee believes that greater efficiencies could be achieved by combining the Marine Corps and Army procurements in 1987 rather than dividing the procurement funds between two years.

The committee therefore recommends no funds be authorized for the procurement of Marine Corps M-198 Howitzers in fiscal year 1986.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
1	ACM INTEGRATION		122.8				122.8
2	B-1B (MYP)	48	7632.7			48	7632.7
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-2170.9				-2170.9
	NET		5461.8				5461.8
	TACTICAL FORCES						
4	F-15 C/D/E	48	2079.3		-80.0	48	1999.3
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-176.4				-176.4
	NET		1902.9		-80.0		1822.9
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		236.0				236.0
6	F-16 C/D (MYP)	180	3277.9		-75.0	180	3202.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-441.2				-441.2
	NET		2836.7		-75.0		2761.7
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		553.1				553.1
	OTHER COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
8	KC-10A (ATCA) (MYP)	12	763.0			12	763.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-524.2				-524.2
	NET		238.8				238.8
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		208.2				208.2
10	MC-130H	1	83.9			1	83.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-10.3				-10.3
	NET		73.6				73.6
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		5.9				5.9
	SUBTOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		11639.8		-155.0		11484.8
	AIRLIFT/TANKER AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRLIFT						
14	C-5B	16	2193.6			16	2193.6
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-251.5				-251.5
	NET		1942.1				1942.1
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		326.0				326.0

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
20	C-20A	8	168.8			8	168.8
	SUBTOTAL, AIRLIFT/TANKER AIRCRAFT		2436.9		0.0		2436.9
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	UPT TRAINERS						
21	T-46A (NGT)	33	165.1			33	165.1
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-22.3				-22.3
	NET		142.8				142.8
22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		63.3				63.3
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT		206.1		0.0		206.1
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
24	HH-60	3	100.0			3	100.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-6.0				-6.0
	NET		94.0				94.0
25	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22.0				22.0
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
28	AURORA		80.1		-80.1		0.0
29	TR-1/U-2	8	352.4		-8.0	8	344.4
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-8.5				-8.5
	NET		343.9		-8.0		335.9
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT		540.0		-88.1		451.9
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
31	B-52		463.6		-75.0		388.6
32	FB-111		13.2				13.2
33	B-1B		5.1				5.1
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
34	A-7		3.4				3.4
35	A-10		87.8				87.8
36	F/RF-4		174.2				174.2
37	F-5		25.7				25.7
38	F-15		141.8				141.8
39	F-16		73.7				73.7
40	F-111		294.5				294.5
42	TR-1A		11.7				11.7

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
44	C-5		9.8				9.8
45	C-141		2.1				2.1
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
46	T-38		40.1				40.1
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
47	KC-10A (ATCA)		4.3				4.3
48	C-12		5.0				5.0
50	C-130		201.0				201.0
52	C-135		868.1				868.1
53	E-3		33.4				33.4
54	E-4		20.4				20.4
55	HH-53 AIRCRAFT		26.4				26.4
56	OTHER AIRCRAFT		133.2				133.2
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
57	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS		114.4				114.4
	CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)						
59	CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)		164.9				164.9
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-203.9		-203.9
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE A/C		2917.8		-278.9		2638.9
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
60	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4934.6				4934.6
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-260.0		-260.0
	SUBTOTAL, AIRCRAFT SPARES & REPAIR PARTS		4934.6		-260.0		4674.6
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
61	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		631.0				631.0
62	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		89.2		-15.0		74.2
63	WAR CONSUMABLES		86.4				86.4
64	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		2683.7		-222.4		2461.3
	SUBTOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		3490.3		-237.4		3252.9
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		26165.5		-1019.4		25146.1

B-1B BOMBER

The administration requested $5,461.8 million in fiscal year 1986 for procurement of 48 B-1B bombers, $162.2 million for associated initial spares, and $418.9 million for replenishment spares. In addition, $367.4 million was requested for research and development. This marks the final procurement request for B-1B bombers under the planned 100 aircraft program.

The committee has been extremely pleased with the progress of the B-1B program in meeting cost and schedule objectives. The program is ahead of the original schedule, as indicated by the maiden sortie of the first production aircraft five months ahead of contractual schedule, and the committee remains convinced that the program remains within budget. The first B-1B squadron of fifteen aircraft will reach its initial operational capability at Dyess AFB, Texas by September 1986.

In a careful review of the two bomber program, the committee heard considerable testimony that supported plans to terminate production of the B-1B with the fiscal year 1986 procurement and to proceed with acquisition plans for the Advanced Technology Bomber. Administration witnesses provided assurances that the competition, which has provided cost control incentives in the two bomber program to date, would be replaced in the follow-on bomber program by internal cost control mechanisms.

While the committee fully supports the two bomber approach to modernization of the strategic bomber force, the committee notes that it has not been shown any recent analysis that supports the force structure proposed by the Air Force. In particular, the committee believes that such factors as bomber force requirements, relative cost, and relative effectiveness (including payload and probability of delivering weapons on target) of alternative delivery platforms, as well as the leverage associated with challenging Soviet defenses with very low observables and electronic countermeasures, should be incorporated in an updated analysis of the future strategic bomber force. The committee therefore directs the Department of Defense to conduct such an analysis and to provide it to the committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by December 1, 1985.

The committee recommends full funding for the B-1B program as requested. The committee believes that development tasks associated with integrated systems testing on the first production aircraft, offensive and defensive systems testing on B-1A aircraft four, and the start of cruise missile testing on B-1B aircraft nine justify the RDT&E request. The committee intends to follow with interest the outcome of ongoing negotiations that will determine whether production savings relative to the cost baseline can be realized. In the meantime, the committee believes that full funding of the procurement request, including spares, is justified.

The Air Force also requested $122.8 million for procurement associated with integrating the Advanced Cruise Missile with the B-1B aircraft. This will enable these modifications to be accomplished during the production of the B-1B. The committee strongly supports this request, consistent with its support of the improved capabilities provided by the ACM.

F-15 (EAGLE) AIR SUPERIORITY FIGHTER

The administration requested $1,902.9 million for the procurement of 48 F-15 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $236.0 million in advance procurement for 48 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The F-15 Eagle is a twin engine, all weather, high performance air superiority fighter. It is an exceptional air-to-air fighter and also possesses an excellent inherent air-to-ground attack capability.

The administration has proposed a variant of the F-15 Eagle, the F-15E, to perform interdiction as well as air superiority missions. This aircraft will incorporate an advanced radar, missionized rear cockpit, increased fuel capacity, and other equipment necessary to perform the long range interdiction mission. Eight F-15Es will be procured in fiscal year 1986, and all F-15s procured in fiscal year 1987 and beyond will be F-15Es. The Air Force intends to procure approximately 420 F-15Es.

The committee recommends an authorization of $1,822.9 million for the procurement of 48 F-15 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $236.0 million in advance procurement for 48 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

F-16 (FALCON)

The administration requested $2,836.7 million for the procurement of 180 F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $553.1 million in advance procurement for 180 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The F-16 is a multi-mission, single-seat, single engine, high performance fighter. It is both an outstanding close-in air-to-air combat aircraft as well as a highly effective air-to-surface attack aircraft. The aircraft produced in 1986 and beyond will be a Multinational Staged Improvement Program (MSIP) F-16 C/Ds with an improved radar and beyond visual range (BVR) missile system which, combined with other avionics improvements, will significantly enhance the capabilities of the F-16.

The committee recommends an authorization of $2,761.7 million for the procurement of 180 F-16 aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $553.1 million in advance procurement for 180 aircraft in 1987. The reduction of $75.0 million is strictly the result of budgetary constraints and is made without prejudice.

KC-10A ADVANCED TANKER/CARGO AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $238.8 million for 12 KC-10A aircraft and $208.2 million in advance procurement for additional aircraft next year.

The request for fiscal year 1986 is part of a multi-year procurement of 44 KC-10A aircraft. The final increment is funded in fiscal year 1987.

The KC-10A is a military derivative of the commercial DC-10-30F widebody aircraft. The KC-10A provides the Air Force considerable flexibility since it can (1) carry cargo, (2) refuel C-141s and C-5s (thus extending their range and take-off payload), and (3) deploy tactical fighter squadrons by carrying personnel and equipment while simultaneously refueling the deploying aircraft.

The committee recommends authorization of $238.8 million for 12 KC-10A aircraft, and $208.2 million for advance procurement, as requested.

MC-130 (COMBAT TALON)

The administration requested $73.6 million for the procurement of 1 MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $5.9 million in advance procurement for 2 aircraft in fiscal year 1987.

The MC-130 Combat Talon is a specially modified C-130 aircraft equipped to support the special operations forces of the unified commands.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft.

C-5B STRATEGIC AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $1,942.1 million for procurement of 16 C-5B aircraft and $326 million for advance procurement.

The C-5B provides intertheater airlift and is the only currently available aircraft that can augment capabilities to carry outsize military weapons and equipment. A total procurement of 50 C-5B aircraft is planned. The committee fully supports this procurement objective. Fifty C-5Bs will add 7.5 million ton-miles per day of strategic airlift capability which will provide a near-term reduction in the substantial intertheater airlift shortfall identified in the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study. Moreover, C-5Bs will provide vitally needed outsized cargo capability as soon as possible. The Air Force has consistently testified to the need for 50 C-5Bs.

The committee recommends authorization of $1,942.1 million for procurement of 16 C-5B aircraft and $326 million for advance procurement, as requested.

T-46A NEXT GENERATION TRAINER (NGT)

The administration requested $142.8 million for the procurement of 33 T-46 Next Generation Trainer (NGT) aircraft in fiscal year 1986 and $63.3 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 1987.

The T-46 NGT is a twin engine, trainer aircraft which will replace the aging T-37 as the Air Force's primary trainer.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the T-46A trainer.

HH-60 (NIGHT HAWK) HELICOPTER

The administration requested $94.0 million for the procurement of 3 Air Force HH-60 Night Hawk helicopters in 1986 and $22.0 million in advance procurement for 1987.

The HH-60 Night Hawk is a variant of the Army's very successful UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter. The Air Force intends to procure 90 HH-60 Night Hawks for Combat Rescue (CR) missions.

This program, once projected to cost more than $5.0 billion to procure 243 aircraft, has been substantially reduced in scope. Under the current plan, the Air Force will procure 90 aircraft at a cost of slightly more than $1.0 billion.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of HH-60 Night Hawk helicopters.

TR-1

The administration requested $343.9 million for the procurement of 8 TR-1 aircraft in fiscal year 1986. The TR-1 is a single engine, fixed wing aircraft designed for high altitude, stand-off surveillance.

The committee recommends an authorization of $335.9 million, a reduction of $8 million from the request, for the procurement of 8 TR-1 aircraft in fiscal year 1986.

B-52 SQUADRONS

The administration requested $16.0 million for research and development, and $463.6 million for procurement associated with modifications for the B-52 bomber force, and $290.8 for spares, including $37.6 million for initial spares associated with the modifications. This program includes a new offensive avionics system, improved electronic countermeasures, an update of the airborne radar and a new autopilot. Also included in this year's request are funds associated with procurement of the Common Strategic Rotary Launcher and with integration of the Advanced Cruise Missile. These system improvements will ensure that the B-52 will continue to operate effectively through the remainder of its planned operational lifetime.

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee would recommend that funding for this program be reduced without prejudice to $388.6 million and directs that there be no change in either the cruise missile related modifications, including CSRL, or in ECM modifications.

KC-135 REENGINING

The administration requested $697.7 million in fiscal year 1986 to reengine 43 KC-135 tanker aircraft with the CFM-56 engine, and for associated modifications. In addition, $29.7 million was requested for initial spares.

The modifications to existing KC-135 tanker aircraft include reskinning of the wings, new nose landing gear, and improved avionics and communications equipment. The resulting KC-135R aircraft provides a 50 percent increase in refueling capability with lower operating and support costs than the current tanker fleet.

The committee continues to support the KC-135R program as the most cost effective means to increase the capability of our tanker fleet, and thus to address the current shortfall in our aerial refueling capability. The committee notes that the most serious tanker shortfall today exists in the area of meeting the requirements of our tactical air forces. The committee, therefore, recommends the authorization of the full amount requested for the KC-135 reengining program in fiscal year 1986.

CIVIL RESERVE AIR FLEET (CRAF)

The committee is concerned about the cost of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program.

The CRAF modification program makes lump-sum payments to United States airline companies to modify selected Boeing-747 aircraft. These modifications enhance the military usefulness of those aircraft in time of national emergency.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to review the merits of this program. If, following this review, the Secretary desires to levy any of the undistributed reduction in the aircraft procurement account against the CRAF program, the Secretary shall first notify by letter the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

ALQ-131 ECM PODS

The administration requested $325.8 million for the procurement of Electronic Countermeasures (ECM) pods, of which $124.6 million was intended for the procurement of Block II ALQ-131 systems. The committee has learned that as a result of technical problems, the production decision for the Block II ALQ-131 pods has been delayed. As a consequence of this delay $100.0 million requested to procure these pods in fiscal year 1986 will not be required.

The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $225.8 million for the procurement of ECM pods, a reduction of $100.0 million from the administration's request.

NIGHT PRECISION ATTACK (LANTIRN)

The administration requested a total of $40.8 million for research and development of the LANTIRN system.

The LANTIRN system consists of two externally mounted pods designed to permit fighter aircraft to conduct low altitude strike and interdiction missions at night and under the weather. The system consists of navigation and targeting Forward Looking InfraRed (FLIR) systems, terrain following radar, a laser target designator, missile boresight correlator and the necessary cooling equipment.

Following Congressional direction, the Air Force recently concluded negotiations with the LANTIRN manufacturer for a firm fixed price proposal for the procurement of the entire inventory objective (700 systems) for LANTIRN. Under this proposal, 700 navigation and targeting pods will be produced within the cost ceiling of $2.31 billion (in constant fiscal year 1980 dollars). The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for research and development of the LANTIRN system. The committee also recommends approval of the $436.4 million requested for LANTIRN procurement.

UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION

The committee recommends an undistributed reduction in the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force account in the amount of $188.9 million. This is to be applied only against the following programs:

KC-10A, C-5B, C-130, and C-20A procurement programs and the C-5, C-141, KC-10A, C-130, C-131, and CRAF modification programs.

CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED TACTICAL MOBILITY STUDY

Last year, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct a tactical mobility study, similar in nature to the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study. The study should examine future tactical mobility requirements, the cost-effectiveness of currently planned programs, and other viable options which would address the tactical mobility problem. The committee's concern stemmed from ongoing force structure and doctrinal changes occurring in the Army and the absence of any study of the effects on air, sea, rail and road mobility requirements.

The committee observes that the report was originally due February 1, 1985 and that it is now overdue.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1966 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
1	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	48	3037.3	-27	-981.0	21	2056.3
	FORCE MODERNIZATION						
3	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT--STRATEGIC		86.7		-3.6		83.1
	SUBTOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES		3124.0		-984.6		2139.4
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
4	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		[ ]				[ ]
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	NET		[ ]				[ ]
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		[ ]				[ ]
6	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE		34.4				34.4
	TACTICAL						
7	AIM-7F/M SPARROW	425	82.3			425	82.3
8	AIM-9L/M SIDEWINDER	800	43.3			800	43.3
9	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	97	48.5			97	48.5
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK	3500	504.0			3500	504.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-15.0				-15.0
	NET		489.0				489.0
13	AGM-88A HARM	1715	478.1			1715	478.1
14	RAPIER		7.6				7.6
15	AMRAAM	90	395.9		-125.0	90	270.9
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-29.4				-29.4
	NET		366.5		-125.0		241.5
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		65.9				65.9
17	GRD LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	95	556.0			95	556.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-11.9				-11.9
	NET		544.1				544.1
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		9.8				9.8

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	TARGET DRONES						
21	TARGET DRONES		35.9				35.9
	TACTICAL DRONES						
23	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		12.9				12.9
24	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT--TACTICAL		14.5				14.5
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		2895.7		-125.0		2770.7
	MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILES						
25	CLASS IV		92.7				92.7
	CLASS V						
26	LGM-30F/G MINUTEMAN II/III		13.5				13.5
	UPDATE						
30	AGM-88A HARM		3.0				3.0
31	UPDATED ALCM		16.5				16.5
32	GRD LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE UPDATE		8.7				8.7
	SUBTOTAL, MODIFICATION OF IN-SERVICE MISSILE		134.5		0.0		134.5
33	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		539.3		0.0		539.3
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
34	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		36.3				36.3
35	GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP)	9	352.0			9	352.0
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-154.6				-154.6
	NET		197.4				197.4
37	SPACE LAUNCH SUPPORT		381.1		-35.0		346.1
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-85.1				-85.1
	NET		296.0		-35.0		261.0
40	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (MYP)		54.0				54.0
42	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM		131.3				131.3
44	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (MYP)	2	187.7			2	187.7
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-52.2				-52.2
	NET		135.5				135.5
45	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		13.7				13.7
46	AF SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM	1	34.4			1	34.4
47	SPACE BOOSTERS	7	126.9			7	126.9

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
48	SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEM		[ ]				[ ]
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
	NET		[ ]				[ ]
49	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		[ ]				[ ]
50	SPACE SHUTTLE		22.1				22.1
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
51	OTHER PROGRAMS		170.0				170.0
52	HAVE FLAG		[ ]				[ ]
53	FOREST GREEN		4.7				4.7
54	IONDS (MYP)		45.8				45.8
55	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		1915.8		-32.4		1883.4
56	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		887.4		40.1		927.5
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT		4169.2		-27.3		4141.9
	ROUNDING ADJUSTMENT		0.1				0.1
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		10862.7		-1136.9		9725.8

ICBM MODERNIZATION PROGRAM

Under the ICBM Modernization Program, the administration requested $1,580.8 million for research and development associated with full scale development of the Peacekeeper missile and advanced development of the small ICBM, associated hard mobile launcher, and follow-on basing modes including superhard silos; and $3,205.8 million for the procurement of 48 Peacekeeper missiles and associated spares.

The committee continues to support the modernization of the ICBM leg of the TRIAD in recognition of the unique characteristics that land based missiles bring to our deterrent posture, and because of the contribution of ICBM modernization to stability and arms control as outlined by the Scowcroft Commission.

Peacekeeper (MX)

With the release of the fiscal year 1985 production funds that were fenced by the 98th Congress, the Congress has approved over eighty percent of the total research and development funding, 42 missiles, and 33 sets of equipment required to modify the existing Minuteman III silos to accommodate the MX. In addition to the 48 missiles requested in fiscal year 1986, the request includes funds for an additional 33 basing sets, and funds required for deployment of 29 missiles approved in prior years, including assembly, checkout and support costs.

The committee has closely followed the progress of the Peacekeeper development program and notes with approval the unprecedented success achieved in the flight test program, particularly with regard to the achievement of accuracy objectives. The committee believes that an operational system that demonstrates the same degree of effectiveness will make a major contribution to restoring the balance in hard target kill capability that can be delivered promptly and reliably.

The committee also notes the very substantial progress that has been made toward meeting the initial deployment date of December 1986. This includes the construction of facilities, deployment planning, support activities, and the transition to production. The committee has carefully reviewed the latest draft report in the continuing General Accounting Office audit of the program, and finds this report very supportive of the progress and cost control achieved in the program. The committee recognizes, as does the GAO, that the achievement of the congressionally mandated initial operational capability in December 1986 is dependent on continued success in the flight test program. The committee, in testimony received this year, finds no reason to doubt that the program will meet its current schedule.

Small ICBM and Hard Mobile Launcher

The small ICBM program had its genesis in the recommendation of the Scowcroft Commission that a synergistic relationship could be structured between the MX and a small mobile ICBM that would be very much in the United States' interest. The counterforce capabilities of the MX would improve the strategic balance and provide important capabilities in the near term and would provide negotiating leverage to reach an arms control agreement that would reduce the number of large, hard target kill ICBMs. The resulting reduction in throw weight could thereafter create a more stable environment in which small ICBM survivability could be increased at less cost. The committee continues to endorse this blueprint, recognizing the integral relationship of the three elements-MX, arms control, and the small ICBM.

The committee strongly supports the concept of mobility, and substantial decreases in throw weight in the interest of stability. The committee recognizes and endorses the mobility advantages of a 30,000 pound missile. However, the committee requires more information about the extent to which the existing weight constraint has resulted in tradeoffs affecting the payload or other features of the small ICBM that relate to its military effectiveness, survivability or cost. In particular, the committee notes that the current baseline does not include penetration aids, although penetration aids could be added in the future with tradeoffs on range and/or missile weight.

The committee commends the Air Force for a well conceived and executed advanced development program that has been characterized by competition and by multiple approaches to the resolution of critical technical and cost uncertainties. The committee believes that the alternative guidance development effort should be given high priority in the interest of affordability, and that penetration aids including evader MARVs, be reconsidered for inclusion as alternative payloads.

Certain features of the current baseline raise questions regarding affordability and effectiveness of the small ICBM. For example, the current baseline guidance concept is very costly for a single warhead missile, and may restrict basing options. It also appears that mobile basing concepts that should be considered, including those that take advantage of the existing infrastructure of our Minuteman missile basing complex, have not received sufficient attention. The committee therefore directs the Air Force to report on the payload, guidance, propulsion and other tradeoffs that have been required by the existing schedule or by weight constraints, and to provide information concerning additional tradeoffs between mobility, guidance and payload options that exist in single warhead missiles up to the Minuteman weight class. These mobility tradeoffs should not be limited to launchers that afford 30 psi hardness levels, but should include the consideration of lower hardness levels and more dispersed basing locations, such as would be available at existing Minuteman facilities. To permit the committee to review these findings prior to the initiation of full scale development, the committee directs the Air Force to submit this report not later than September 1, 1985.

The committee further directs that an independent review of small missile and basing options be conducted by the Defense Science Board. The results of this review should be provided to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate prior to submission of the fiscal year 1987 defense budget.

In the interest of expediting the evaluation of environmental impacts so that the earliest possible initial operational capability for the small ICBM could be achieved, the conferees for the fiscal year

1985 Defense Authorization Act directed that a legislative environmental impact statement be prepared to address the peacetime environmental impacts of alternate basing modes and deployment areas. Section 203 of the fiscal year 1986 Authorization Act provides statutory language to that same end.

Follow-on Basing

The Department of Defense has made impressive progress during the last year in research to demonstrate and validate superhard silo technologies through testing. On the basis of overpressure testing of hardened silo structures, it appears that designs that incorporate concrete, which is heavily reinforced with steel and confined by steel liners, offer promise of hardening many times that of existing silo structures. In addition, component testing and shock isolation system technology efforts suggest that system level hardness can be made equivalent to structure hardness.

The committee notes with regret that superhard silos do not appear to be an option for the deployment of MX before most of the 100 missiles would be deployed under current Air Force plans, and that current estimates of cost for MX-sized superhard silos would appear to put the option out of reach as an affordable and cost effective basing option for MX. The committee fully supports continued exploration of these technologies as a possible basing option for the small ICBM, or as a hedge against the failure of arms control negotiations.

Also included in the follow-on basing technology effort is an investigation of deep underground basing. Significant progress has been made in this research, which is concentrated on the effects of nuclear weapons on deep underground facilities, evaluation of alternative power and support systems, communications, and tunneling technology. The committee supports this research, both as a basing option for a secure reserve force of land based missiles, and as a possible option for survivable and enduring command, control and communications functions.

Recommendations

In view of budgetary and other considerations, the committee did not recommend increasing the production rate from less than two missiles per month to four missiles per month as requested by the administration. The committee recommends stabilizing the production line at current levels by procurement of 21 missiles in fiscal year 1986. The committee recommends procurement of 18 sets of equipment for silo modifications, a reduction of 15 from the administration's request, and recommends the full amount requested for support efforts to deploy 29 missiles in existing silos. With these recommendations, the administration would have the full funding required to deploy a total of 40 missiles in existing silos, and hardware required to deploy 50 missiles. The remaining 13 missiles would be for testing and the committee recommends that the additional equipments required for operational test missiles be procured. The net effect of the combined missile and basing recommendation would be to reduce procurement funding by $981 million. The committee recommends full funding of the research and development request for MX.

Committee recommendations regarding the small ICBM program are outlined above. The committee recommends that the full amount requested, $515.4 million for the missile and $109.1 million for the hard mobile launcher, be authorized for research and development associated with the small ICBM.

Due to budget constraints, the committee recommends funding of $157.2 million for follow-on basing, a reduction of $15.0 million in the hard silo research effort.

MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS

The administration requested $31.2 million for research and development associated with the continued effectiveness of the deployed Minuteman force, and a total of $343.3 million for procurement including $101.7 million for modifications, $86.7 million for replacement of maintenance support equipment, $144.2 million for replenishment spares and $10.7 for initial spares.

The majority of the funds for modifications are requested for improvements to the Minuteman II guidance system, improvement to the security systems at the launch facilities, and installation of more survivable communications. The committee recognizes and supports the need to modernize existing equipments for maintainability reasons.

Due to budget constraints, the committee would recommend without prejudice a reduction of $9 million in Minuteman related research and development and $3.6 million in Minuteman related procurement. Although the procurement reduction is applied to the request for "Missile Replacement Equipment-Strategic," the committee would consider this to be an undistributed reduction against the Minuteman procurement account, including spares.

AGM-65D IIR MAVERICK

The administration requested $489.0 million for the procurement of 3,500 AGM-65D Maverick missiles for the Air Force.

The AGM-65D Maverick is a rocket propelled, air-to-surface precision guided tactical missile. The IIR Maverick employs imaging infra-red guidance and is intended for use day or night under conditions of limited visibility against such targets as tanks, armored personnel carriers, field fortifications, reinforced buildings, revetted targets and POL storage facilities.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the procurement of IIR Maverick missiles.

ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)

The administration requested $366.5 million for the procurement of 90 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) in fiscal year 1986 and $65.9 million for advanced procurement of missiles in 1987.

The AMRAAM is a medium range, radar guided, all-aspect air-to-air missile designed to replace the AIM-7 Sparrow in both the Air Force and Navy inventories. The AMRAAM is currently in full scale development, with the first procurement of missiles scheduled for fiscal year 1986.

The committee strongly endorses the requirement to develop an advanced beyond visual range (BVR) missile to ensure the superiority of United States and NATO fighters. While the AMRAAM program appears to be a sound technical approach toward meeting this requirement, cost increases have placed the program in jeopardy. Originally projected to cost no more than the AIM-7 Sparrow, (approximately $190,000 per missile in 1986) the AMRAAM is now projected to cost considerably more than the Sparrow. The fact that the total program cost grew nearly $1.7 billion–from $7.5 billion in fiscal year 1985 to $9.2 billion in fiscal year 1986–with no change in the quantity of missiles to be procured, is a clear indication that program costs are not under control.

In recognition of the serious cost problems facing the AMRAAM program, the Secretary of Defense has directed the program be revised. This revision includes restructuring the full scale development program as well as the establishment of a multi-service/OSD (Office of the Secretary of Defense) committee to evaluate the feasibility of alternative approaches to meeting AMRAAM requirements, the establishment of a second committee to review operational requirements, and the implementation of an AMRAAM producability program aimed at reducing production costs. The committee supports these efforts.

The acquisition strategy for the AMRAAM anticipates the qualification of a second source manufacturer to provide competition for the prime contractor. The committee believes that, should Air Force and OSD efforts to reduce the cost of the AMRAAM be successful, and production of the missile is approved, it is essential that vigorous competition be established at the earliest possible date. The committee also believes that greater efforts will be required in the area of producability cost reductions.

The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $241.5 million for the procurement of AMRAAM missiles. These funds shall be allocated as necessary to achieve early and vigorous competition in the event production is approved. However, none of the funds authorized for missile procurement in fiscal year 1986 shall be obligated or expended until 30 days after the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services have been apprised of the results of the producability and alternatives studies directed by the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Defense certifies that production of the missile is warranted. The committee also recommends authorization of $65.9 million in advance procurement subject to the same restrictions imposed on fiscal year 1986 procurement funds.

GROUND-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (GLCM)

The administration requested $544.1 million for the procurement of 95 ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) in fiscal year 1986, and $9.8 million for advanced procurement associated with future missiles. In addition, $0.7 million was requested for research and development, and $1.3 million for initial spares. $55.1 million was requested for replenishment spares associated with the GLCM program. A variant of the Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missile designed for deployment on a road mobile launcher, the GLCM is capable of attacking hardened enemy targets at long ranges.

Deployment of ground-launched cruise missiles in Western Europe is an integral element of NATO's theater nuclear force modernization program announced in December 1979. Deployment of this system in the United Kingdom and Italy has been ongoing since 1983. The committee notes with approval and appreciation Belgium's decision to abide by its commitment to the deployment of GLCMs. In the committee's view, the unity and firmness of resolve demonstrated by our NATO allies on this issue will continue to play an important role in the negotiations in Geneva.

The committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for the GLCM program in fiscal year 1986.

SPACE LAUNCH SUPPORT

The administration requested $79.2 million for research and development, and $296.0 million for procurement associated with Space Launch Support in fiscal year 1986. (Operations and Maintenance funding for this program in fiscal year 1986 amounts to $662.5 million.)

This program funds Department of Defense Shuttle operations including those at Vandenberg Air Force Base, the orbiter flight charge reimbursements to NASA, and procurement of the Centaur G, Inertial Upper Stage (IUS), and Payload Assist Module Delta Class II (PAM-D II) upper stage vehicles. These upper stage vehicles boost the payload from shuttle orbits, or from altitudes achieved by launch vehicles such as Atlas and Titan, to the orbits required to perform the mission. The Centaur, IUS and PAM-D II upper stage vehicles are capable of boosting to geostationary orbits payloads of 10,000 pounds, 5,000 pounds and 3,000 pounds respectively.

The fiscal year 1986 procurement request is required to continue PAM-D II multi-year procurement to support the NAVSTAR GPS program, to modify IUS vehicles to correct the problem experienced during the launch of NASA's Tracking and Data Relay Satellite, and to fund three IUS vehicles for which advance procurement funding was provided in fiscal year 1985.

The committee recommends full funding of the request for research and development. Due to budgetary constraints, however, the committee reluctantly recommends a reduction of $35.0 million in the fiscal year 1986 procurement request.

SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

The administration requested $149.9 million for research and development, and $83.0 million for procurement of Space Defense Systems in fiscal year 1986. This request provides for the procurement of three miniature homing vehicle anti-satellite (ASAT) systems. Of the funds requested for research and development, $72.9 million is required for activities at the Cheyenne Mountain Complex to support the ASAT program. In addition, $14.9 million was requested for advanced procurement of future missiles.

The committee remains concerned by the wide range of Soviet anti-satellite capabilities, and the threats these systems pose to a number of important United States space assets. The committee continues to support the development and eventual deployment of a United States ASAT capability. Such a capability would pose some degree of deterrent to a Soviet attack on United States space assets, and it would also deny the Soviets a sanctuary in space from which to conduct hostile military activities against United States and allied terrestrial forces. The development of a United States ASAT capability should complement other important efforts to enhance the survivability of our key space assets, and should not be viewed as an alternative to these important activities.

The committee understands that limitations on anti-satellite weapons will be a subject for discussion between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Defense and Space Negotiations in Geneva. In view of the enormous difficulties associated with such limitations, including the presence of inherent ASAT capabilities in some systems designed for other purposes, the committee anticipates that this will be a lengthy process. Similar negotiations under the Carter administration made very little progress. Due to the high value and limited number of United States space assets threatened by Soviet ASAT capabilities, verification standards will have to be particularly stringent to guard against the possibility of breakout.

While these negotiations are underway, the committee believes that it would be ill-advised and counter-productive to our negotiating efforts for the Congress to impose any unilateral limitations on the development of the United States ASAT capability. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for procurement of Space Defense Systems in fiscal year 1986. Due to budgetary constraints, however, the committee recommends a reduction of $5.0 million from the request for research and development at the Cheyenne Mountain Complex. The committee is quite concerned by delays in the ASAT research and development program, and it will be watching production costs very carefully.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT						
	ROCKETS AND LAUNCHERS						
1	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	100000	22.3			100000	22.3
2	GTR-18 MISSILE SIMULATOR	65867	2.0			65867	2.0
4	ROCKET TRAINING 35MM	52280	1.7			52280	1.7
5	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		4.6				4.6
	CARTRIDGES (THOUSANDS)						
6	9 MM PARABELLUM	10000	1.2	-10000	-1.2	0	0.0
8	5.56 MM	29513	4.5			29513	4.5
10	20 MM TRAINING	450	1.5			450	1.5
11	30 MM TRAINING	9000	100.4			9000	100.4
13	30 MM API	2165	30.6			2165	30.6
15	40 MM TP GRENADES	750	3.5			750	3.5
16	40 MM HE GRENADES	1009	16.6			1009	16.6
18	CART CHAFF, RR-170	5707	17.8			5707	17.8
19	CART CHAFF, RR-136	67	0.5			67	0.5
20	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	1258	1.7			1258	1.7
21	MXU-4A/A ENGINE STARTER	50	5.0			50	5.0
22	CART IMP 3000 FT/LBS	1913	4.3			1913	4.3
24	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		8.6				8.6
	BOMBS						
25	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	49638	13.4			49638	13.4
26	DURANDAL	3483	94.5			3483	94.5
27	TIMER ACTUATOR FIN FUZE	5000	2.0			5000	2.0
28	BSU-49 INFLATABLE RETARDER	51392	34.7			51392	34.7
29	BSU-50 INFLATABLE RETARDER	9300	10.2			9300	10.2
30	BOMB 2000 LB HIGH EXPLOSIVE	13006	34.1			13006	34.1
31	CLUSTER BOMB, MK-20 (ROCKEYE)	1496	4.4			1496	4.4
32	LASER BOMB GUIDANCE KIT	2575	103.7		-50.0	2575	53.7
33	GBU-15	715	127.9			715	127.9
34	BOMB, PRACTICE 25 POUND	100000	20.9			100000	20.9
35	BOMB, PRACTICE BDU-38	683	5.4			683	5.4
36	BOMB, PRACTICE MK-106	122472	1.3			122472	1.3
37	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	4736	6.8			4736	6.8
38	CBU-89 (TMD/GATOR)	4406	202.0			4406	202.0
39	CBU-87 (COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITION)	22500	552.9			22500	552.9
40	BIGEYE	425	22.1			425	22.1
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		1.5				1.5
	TARGETS						
42	AERIAL TOW TARGET	365	8.4			365	8.4
43	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.3				0.3

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	OTHER ITEMS						
45	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	563040	13.3			563040	13.3
46	FLARE, PARA, LUU-4B	3600	1.4			3600	1.4
47	FLARE, IR MJU-2	100022	3.1			100022	3.1
49	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	228000	1.4			228000	1.4
51	SIGNAL, SMOKE/ILLUM MK-6	20356	2.0			20356	2.0
52	SIGNAL SMOKE AND ILLUMINATING	109944	2.4			109944	2.4
53	MC-3468, RETARD DEVICE	153	1.9			153	1.9
54	RAPID MUNITIONS ASSEMBLY	46	3.9			46	3.9
58	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		9.5				9.5
59	MODIFICATIONS		0.7				0.7
60	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		21.3		-2.3		19.0
	FUZES						
62	FMU-130	10500	8.4			10500	8.4
63	FMU-112/FMU-139	75000	61.7			75000	61.7
65	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.2				0.2
	OTHER WEAPONS						
66	M-203 GRENADE LAUNCHER	1314	0.8			1314	0.8
67	MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM, M-60	1259	3.8			1259	3.8
68	GAU-5 MACHINE GUN	2917	1.4			2917	1.4
69	40MM MACHINE GUN, MK-19	499	4.2			499	4.2
70	9MM HANDGUN	19000	6.8	-19000	-6.8	0	0.0
	SUBTOTAL, MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		1621.8		-60.3		1561.5
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
71	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	293	1.9			293	1.9
72	STATION WAGON, 4X2	283	2.2			283	2.2
73	BUS, 28 PASSENGER	155	4.8			155	4.8
74	BUS, INTERCITY	10	1.8			10	1.8
75	BUS, 44 PASSENGER	81	2.8			81	2.8
76	AMBULANCE, BUS	27	2.1			27	2.1
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
78	TRUCK, STAKE/PLATFORM	540	6.8			540	6.8
79	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	406	4.5			406	4.5
80	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	486	4.4			486	4.4
81	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	850	6.5			850	6.5
82	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	1168	6.4			1168	6.4
84	TRUCK, MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	751	11.7			751	11.7
85	TRUCK, PANEL, 4X2	348	3.5			348	3.5
86	SHOP VAN 4X4	20	0.9			20	0.9
87	TRUCK, CARRYALL	571	7.5			571	7.5
88	COMMERCIAL UTILITY CARGO VEHICLE	258	3.6			258	3.6
89	TRUCK, CARGO, 2 1/2T, 6X6, M-35	371	15.6			371	15.6
90	TRUCK, CARGO 5T M-923.M-925	223	17.1			223	17.1

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
91	SEMI-TRAILER, 20 T	34	0.4			34	0.4
93	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	594	15.3			594	15.3
95	TRUCK, TRACTOR 5T M-932 (MYP)	15	1.0			15	1.0
96	TRUCK, TRACTOR, OVER 5T	102	4.4			102	4.4
97	TRUCK, WRECKER	7	0.4			7	0.4
98	TRUCK, WRECKER 5T M936 (MYP)	26	3.9			26	3.9
99	TRUCK, DUMP 5 TON	183	8.1			183	8.1
100	TRUCK, UTILITY	218	2.2			218	2.2
102	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		8.4				8.4
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
103	TRUCK, MAINT 4X2	287	2.6			287	2.6
104	TRUCK, MAINT, 4X4	101	1.2			101	1.2
105	TRUCK, MAINT, HI-REACH	26	2.1			26	2.1
106	TRUCK, TELEPHONE MAINTENANCE	26	3.8			26	3.8
107	TRUCK, TANK, 1200 GAL	56	2.0			56	2.0
108	TRUCK, TANK FUEL R-9	216	23.6			216	23.6
109	TRUCK, TANK, FUEL, M-49	31	1.8			31	1.8
111	TRUCK, TANK, LIQ NIT, C-5	2	0.5			2	0.5
113	TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4	110	2.9			110	2.9
114	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	260	3.9			260	3.9
115	TRACTOR, WHEELED, INDUSTRIAL	150	1.9			150	1.9
116	TRACTOR, DOZER	37	2.4			37	2.4
118	VEHICLE, LAW ENFORCEMENT	271	2.3			271	2.3
119	TRUCK, DEMINERAL WATER, 2600 GAL	9	0.9			9	0.9
120	TRUCK, HI LIFT C5	2	0.1			2	0.1
121	TRUCK, HI LIFT 3T	3	0.2			3	0.2
122	TRUCK, HI LIFT, 9T	3	0.2			3	0.2
123	TRUCK, REFUSE	23	1.8			23	1.8
124	TRUCK, HYDRANT FUEL	39	3.9			39	3.9
125	TRAILER WATER M149	21	0.2			21	0.2
126	TRAILER FUEL A1B	15	0.2			15	0.2
128	SEMI TRAILER COMPRESSED GAS	16	2.7			16	2.7
129	SEMI TRAILER TANK UDMH	1	0.1			1	0.1
131	DOLLY MB32	19	0.4			19	0.4
133	TRACTOR WHEELED W DOZER	3	0.4			3	0.4
134	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		7.5				7.5
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
135	TRUCK, CRASH P-4/P-19	140	23.8			140	23.8
136	TRUCK, CRASH P-15	5	3.5			5	3.5
137	TRUCK, CRASH P-2	18	8.2			18	8.2
138	TRUCK, WATER P-18	52	3.9			52	3.9
139	TRUCK, PUMPER P-8	16	1.9			16	1.9
140	TRUCK, PUMPER P-12	2	0.2			2	0.2
141	TRUCK, CRASH P-10	14	0.4			14	0.4
142	TRUCK, CRASH P-13/P-20	20	0.5			20	0.5
144	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.8				0.8
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
145	TRUCK, F/L 4,000 LB GED/DED 144'	151	2.2			151	2.2
146	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	203	4.9			203	4.9

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
147	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	196	10.9			196	10.9
148	TRUCK F/L LARGE CAPACITY AT	10	0.6			10	0.6
149	TRUCK, F/L 15000 LB	19	0.8			19	0.8
150	LARGE CAPACITY LOADER	10	4.3			10	4.3
151	25K A/C LOADER	45	6.3			45	6.3
153	TRACTOR, WHSE, 4,000 LB	101	0.8			101	0.8
154	CONTAINER, LIFT, TRUCK	20	4.5			20	4.5
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		2.7				2.7
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
156	LOADER, SCOOP	54	3.6			54	3.6
157	LOADER, SCOOP, W/BACKHOE	20	0.7			20	0.7
158	DISTRIBUTOR, WATER 1500 GALLON	69	3.5			69	3.5
160	CLEANER, RUNWAY/STREET	139	6.0			139	6.0
161	ROLLER, VIBRATING	29	0.7			29	0.7
162	TRUCK, DUMP 221	9	0.9			9	0.9
163	GRADER, ROAD, MOTORIZED	54	3.1			54	3.1
164	CRANE, 7-50 TON	23	3.1			23	3.1
165	EXCAVATOR, DED, PT	38	4.3			38	4.3
166	WATERCRAFT	3	4.3			3	4.3
167	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		4.5				4.5
168	MODIFICATIONS		0.2				0.2
169	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		7.2				7.2
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-10.0		-10.0
	SUBTOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		340.9		-10.0		330.9
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT (COMSEC)						
170	SPACE SYSTEMS (COMSEC)		33.5				33.5
171	TEMPEST EQUIPMENT		0.5				0.5
172	TAC SECURE VOICE		13.2				13.2
173	DCS SECURE VOICE (COMSEC)		27.7				27.7
174	SECURE DATA		41.0				41.0
175	TRI-TAC (COMSEC)		28.6				28.6
176	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7.6				7.6
177	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		0.3				0.3
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
178	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS		29.4		-5.6		23.8
179	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		9.1				9.1
180	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP		4.6				4.6
182	COBRA SHOE		3.0				3.0
183	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		6.4				6.4
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
184	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		5.0				5.0
185	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVE		95.4		-23.0		72.4
186	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST		31.6				31.6
187	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM		117.8				117.8

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
188	OTH-B RADAR		237.0				237.0
189	SACDIN		1.1				1.1
190	SAC COMMAND AND CONTROL		11.1				11.1
191	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		61.0				61.0
192	PAVE PAWS/SLBM WARNING SYSTEMS		9.0				9.0
193	BMEWS MODERNIZATION		70.8				70.8
194	SPACETRACK		10.1				10.1
195	NAVSTAR GPS		7.4				7.4
196	USAFE COMMAND/CONTROL SYSTEM		12.1				12.1
197	PACAF COMMAND/CONTROL		9.9				9.9
198	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG		10.0				10.0
200	CARIBBEAN BASIN RADAR NETWORK		4.4				4.4
201	MARS/USAF-FAA RADAR UPGRADE		16.6				16.6
202	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT		34.7				34.7
203	DIST EARLY WARNING RDR/NORTH WARNING		8.9				8.9
204	TRANSPORT GROUND INTERCEPT FACIL		17.5				17.5
205	TR-1 GROUND STATIONS		74.6				74.6
206	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY		1.6				1.6
207	TEREC GROUND PROCESSOR		4.1				4.1
208	IMAGERY TRANS		37.5				37.5
210	TACTICAL WARNING SYSTEMS SUPPORT		0.4				0.4
211	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE C3		22.4				22.4
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
212	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		170.5				170.5
213	WWMCCS ADPE		36.4				36.4
214	MAC COMMAND AND CONTROL SUPPORT		13.3				13.3
215	GLCM COMMUNICATIONS		14.5				14.5
216	AIR BASE DEFENSE/AF PHYS SECURITY		52.5				52.5
217	WEAPONS STORAGE/SECURITY		2.9				2.9
218	RANGE IMPROVEMENTS		105.2		-15.0		90.2
219	HF RADIO CONSOLIDATION		9.8				9.8
220	RADAR BOMB SCORER		9.1				9.1
221	PLSS		25.1				25.1
222	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		21.4				21.4
223	SPACE SHUTTLE		5.0				5.0
225	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM		64.9				64.9
226	SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY		66.3				66.3
228	CONSTANT WATCH		15.9				15.9
229	CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPS CENTER		17.6				17.6
230	CMD CENTER PROCESSING/DISPLAY SYS		2.6				2.6
231	HAMMER ACE		0.8				0.8
232	SAMTO TEST RANGES I&M		32.1				32.1
233	EMP HARDENING		12.7				12.7
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
234	PROGRAM 698AJ		2.0				2.0
235	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS		5.7				5.7
236	TELEPHONE EXCHANGE		52.9				52.9
237	JOINT TACTICAL COMM PROGRAM		161.9				161.9
238	USREDCOM		3.0				3.0
239	USCENTCOM		26.1				26.1

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
241	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG		19.1				19.1
243	TELETYPEWRITER EQUIPMENT		11.7				11.7
244	SATELLITE TERMINALS		65.1				65.1
	DCA PROGRAMS						
245	WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE		45.7				45.7
247	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NET		14.4				14.4
248	DCS SECURE VOICE EQUIPMENT		18.4				18.4
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
249	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		17.9				17.9
250	PRODUCTIVITY INV TELECOM		16.4				16.4
251	RADIO EQUIPMENT		38.6				38.6
253	FIBER OPTICS		1.4				1.4
254	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		4.5				4.5
255	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		4.7				4.7
257	E & I REQUIREMENTS		10.8				10.8
258	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		398.5				398.5
259	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		15.5				15.5
	MODIFICATIONS						
260	COMM-ELECTRONICS CLASS IV		39.4				39.4
261	TRAFFIC CONTROL/LANDING		3.4				3.4
264	TACTICAL EQUIPMENT		25.4				25.4
265	ANTIJAM VOICE		19.0				19.0
	UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION		---		-50.0		-50.0
	SUBTOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMM EQUIP		2816.8		-93.6		2723.2
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
266	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE		52.8				52.8
267	NEWARK AFS CALIBRATION PACKAGE		3.4				3.4
268	TEST EQUIPMENT-GEN PURP		39.7				39.7
269	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		42.0		-7.0		35.0
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT						
270	LIFE RAFT, 20 MAN	652	1.0			652	1.0
271	AUTOMATIC LIFE PERSERVER	3000	3.7			3000	3.7
272	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	683	8.4			683	8.4
273	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG		81.2				81.2
274	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		7.0				7.0
	DEPOT PLANT AND MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
275	BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT		37.5				37.5
276	AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP		1.2				1.2
278	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		18.5		-5.0		13.5

LINE NO.		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
279	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC		30.1				30.1
280	FLOOD LIGHTS	900	10.7			900	10.7
281	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		0.5				0.5
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
283	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT		132.3				132.3
284	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY		36.7				36.7
285	COB ESSENTIAL FACILITIES		11.6				11.6
287	BARRIER, AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEM	2	0.2			2	0.2
288	PALLET, AIR CARGO, 108"X88"	3000	2.7			3000	2.7
289	NET ASSEMBLY, 108"X88"		3.3				3.3
290	PUMPS AND COMPRESSORS		1.3				1.3
291	MOBILITY CONTAINERS	341	2.1			341	2.1
292	BLADDERS FUEL	183	2.7			183	2.7
293	TACTICAL SHELTER	72	17.8			72	17.8
294	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		6.5				6.5
296	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS		0.9				0.9
297	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		43.1				43.1
298	WARTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT		5.1				5.1
299	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14.3				14.3
300	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000		17.8		-2.8		15.0
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
301	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY		18.9				18.9
302	SCIENTIFIC/TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE		4.6				4.6
303	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ		4.9				4.9
304	DEFENSE DISSEMINATION SYSTEM		21.4		-6.7		14.7
305	AF TECHNICAL APPLICATION CENTER		15.9				15.9
306	PHOTO PROC/INTERPRET SYS		11.3				11.3
307	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		3933.1		-17.0		3916.1
308	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		86.5				86.5
309	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		14.3				14.3
310	MISC EQUIPMENT		6.5				6.5
311	MODIFICATIONS		5.1				5.1
	SUBTOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINT & SUPPORT EQUIP		4758.6		-38.5		4720.1
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		9538.0		-202.4		9335.6

STRATEGIC C3 OVERVIEW

FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST

[Dollars in millions]

	Procurement	RDT&E
Defense Satellite Communication System	(2)/149.2	6.9
Minimum Essential Emergency Communications System (MEECN)	0	[1] 97.2
Exremely Low Frequency Communications	(34)/13.2	28.3
Air Force Satellite Communications	(1)/34.4	0
Fleet Satellite Communications (FLTSATCOM)	56.3	10.2
Defense Meteorological Satellite Program	45.0	71.3

[1] Includes $24.1 million for the Ground Wave Emergency Network (GWEN).

The administration's fiscal year 1986 request contained funds to continue with a number of improvements to United States strategic command, control, communications and warning capabilities. The committee discusses several additional strategic C3 programs elsewhere in this report.

The committee views these modernization programs as one of the highest priorities within the strategic force modernization program. These improvements make an important contribution to stability and deterrence by permitting the confident and flexible employment of United States forces. In the committee's view, our strategic force modernization programs can be no more effective or survivable than the command, control and communications systems that support them. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of the full amount requested for these important programs.

ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000

The requested amounts in these accounts (line numbers 60, 269, 278, and 300) were higher than most accounts in Air Force, Other Procurement. Because of the cost of the items, little breakout or justification is available for the relatively high increase from fiscal year 1985 to fiscal year 1986. The funding increases and levels give the appearance of a holding area or a source for future reprogramming efforts. The recommended reductions shown in the above chart do not zero the line, but rather are meant to encourage greater line breakout.

LOW LEVEL LASER GUIDED BOMB (LLLGB)

The administration requested $103.7 million for the procurement of 2,575 Low Level Laser Guided Bomb (LLLGB) kits. The LLLGB, also known as Paveway III, is an improved version of the Paveway II laser guided bomb. The LLLGB is an air launched, precision guided weapon designed to increase the survivability of tactical aircraft by permitting low altitude, standoff, weapons delivery.

As a result of program stretchouts and various other difficulties encountered during 1984, the unit cost of the LLLGB (as represented in the Selected Acquisition Report (SAR)) increased from $25,100 (program acquisition unit cost) in December 1983 to $34,900 in December 1984. As a result of this substantial cost increase, the Secretary of the Air Force advised the committee on February 6, 1985 that the Air Force would cancel the LLLGB program following the completion of the 1985 procurement.

Subsequent to the Air Force decision to terminate the program, the manufacturer of the LLLGB submitted a 5-year multi-year, fixed-price proposal to produce the LLLGB at a "not too exceed" price of $25,100 each–the same price that was reported in the December 1983 SAR.

On the basis of this favorable proposal, the committee recommends an authorization of $53.7 million for the procurement of LLLGB kits. This recommendation is intended to keep open the option of LLLGB production beyond 1985 should the administration, after a thorough review of the manufacturer's revised proposal, determine that continued production is warranted. Should the administration decide that further production is not warranted, these funds may be applied to procure other laser guided weapons such as Paveway II or the Navy's Skipper in order to meet inventory requirements.

OVER-THE-HORIZON BACKSCATTER (OTH-B) RADAR

The administration requested $67.5 million for research and development, and $237.0 million for procurement of the Over-the-Horizon Backscatter (OTH-B) Radar in fiscal year 1986. In addition, $26.9 million was requested for associated initial spares.

The OTH-B radar system is designed to provide all-altitude early warning of bomber and cruise missile threats against the continental United States. By providing the National Command Authority with more timely and reliable warning information, the OTH-B radar system will make an important contribution to deterrence.

The OTH-B radar system is an important element of the President's October 1981 Strategic Force Modernization Program. The importance of this program has been further increased as a result of the expansion of the Soviet sea-launched cruise missile threat. The committee continues to attach a high priority to the strategic force modernization program, particularly those aspects that relate to strategic command, control, communications and warning improvements. The committee, therefore, recommends the authorization of the full amount requested for the OTH-B radar in fiscal year 1986.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST		CHANGE FROM REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT:						
1	OSD/WHS:		59.4				59.4
2	NSA: CLASSIFIED EQUIPMENT		[ ]		-0.3		-0.3
	DNA:						
3	VEHICLES		0.2				0.2
4	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		5.6				5.6
	DCA:						
5	WWMCCS ADP SYSTEMS		14.8				14.6
6	DEFENSE SWITCHING NETWORK		10.8				10.8
7	ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		43.7				43.7
8	DIA: INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS		[ ]		-0.8		-0.8
	DLA:						
9	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		13.6				13.6
10	VEHICLES		1.9				1.9
11	MECHANIZED MATERIALS HANDLING SYSTEMS		16.4				16.4
12	ADP EQUIPMENT		74.6				74.6
13	TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		11.0				11.0
14	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		6.8				6.8
	DMA:						
17	ADP EQUIPMENT		16.8				16.8
19	VEHICLES		0.3				0.3
20	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		26.6				26.6
21	AF PHASE IV COMPUTER		4.2				4.2
24	PASS REPLACEMENT		2.7				2.7
25	DIS: VEHICLES		1.7				1.7
27	USUHS: ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		0.7				0.7
28	DCAA: ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		7.6				7.6
29	DAVA: ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		0.5				0.5
30	DRSP: ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		[ ]				[ ]
31	DIG: ITEMS LESS THAN $900,000 EACH		[ ]				[ ]
	TOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES PROCUREMENT		1391.9		-1.1		1390.8

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE PROCUREMENT

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST QTY	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AMOUNT
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
1	RESERVE, ARMY		0.0				0.0
2	RESERVE, NAVY						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0.0		20.0		20.0
3	RESERVE, MARINE CORPS		0.0				0.0
4	RESERVE, AIR FORCE		0.0				0.0
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
5	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0.0		100.0		100.0
6	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0.0		30.0		30.0
	C-130 AIRCRAFT		0.0	8	150.0	8	150.0
	C-131 AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS		0.0		12.0		12.0
	SUBTOTAL, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		0.0		192.0		192.0
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		0.0		312.0		312.0

Beginning in 1981 and 1982, the committee recommended plans to provide some $2.6 billion specifically earmarked for the everyday equipment needs of the National Guard and Reserve components over the next 5 years. Equipment shortfalls recognized at that time included trucks, radios, boats, trailers, medical equipment, tool sets and the common, daily equipment needed by the units. Since that time, over $700.0 million has been authorized and appropriated for this purpose. However, there continues to be a substantial shortfall in the equipment needed to meet full wartime mobilization.

The equipment status report required by law on the Guard and Reserve Components identified a shortage of some $12.4 billion worth of equipment. The fiscal year 1986 Defense budget for the National Guard and Reserve Components totals $4.0 billion, approximately $1.8 billion less than provided last year, and only 4 percent of the total procurement budget request.

The committee, therefore, recommends a continuation of funding for the everyday equipment needs of Guard and Reserve units and an authorization of $312.0 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1986 to be earmarked and appropriated for the individual National Guard and Reserve components. The Chief of each National Guard and Reserve component shall allocate these funds to equip units in a way that will provide the most military capability for the money. This additional $312.0 million is to be appropriated in the following amounts:

Army National Guard - $100.0 million (for medical equipment, radios, howitzers, tractors, and other unit equipment).

Air National Guard - $30.0 million (for communications equipment and other unit equipment).

Naval Reserve - $20.0 million (for unit equipment and supplies in naval mobile construction battalions--the committee requests that naval mobile construction battalion equipment be managed by unit sets to facilitate rapid deployment).

Air National Guard - $150.0 million (for 8 C-130 aircraft).

Air National Guard - $12.0 million (to re-engine and modify 3 additional C-131 aircraft).

The committee requests that the Chief of each Guard and Reserve Component receiving such funds provide a detailed report to the Armed Services Committee on the items of equipment to be procured with such funds within 120 days after date of enactment of this Act.

C-130H AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration did not request authorization in fiscal year 1986 for procurement of C-130H tactical airlift aircraft.

The Reserve components (Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve) provide 64 percent of the tactical airlift assets for the Air Force. Many of the C-130s in use in the Reserve components today are C-130A model aircraft with an average age of 28 years. These aircraft are increasingly expensive to maintain and operate.

Therefore, the committee recommends the authorization of $150 million for the procurement of eight C-130 aircraft for the Air National Guard.

PROCUREMENT OF C-130 AIRCRAFT STUDY

The C-130 airframe is used for a variety of missions. The Marine Corps uses a tanker version of the C-130, the Navy uses the TACAMO C-130 for strategic connectivity and the Air Force uses both the basic C-130 and a modified version, the MC-130 for various airlift missions. The committee feels that the Department of Defense could possibly benefit from procurement authority for the basic C-130 airframe. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to study the possible savings that could be derived from procurement of the C-130 and report his findings to the Congress not later than December 1, 1985.

C-131 MODIFICATIONS

Last year, the Congress provided $8 million for modifications to two C-131 mission support aircraft operated by the Air National Guard. The modifications would provide two C-131 ANG aircraft with turbo-prop engines, radar, and instrumentation to allow for larger carrying capacity, operation in adverse weather, and operation with a larger margin of safety.

This test program offers a possible alternative to replacing C-131s with the smaller C-12s or the larger C-130s. This is attractive because the C-12s cannot provide the required payload and cargo capability, while the C-130s would be more expensive.

The committee notes the Department has not obligated funds to this project in compliance with Congressional direction and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a letter to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to July 1, 1985, or the beginning of conference on this legislation between Senate and House Members, whichever is sooner, which describes the status of this test program and states the Secretary's intentions for this program. The committee encourages the Secretary to obligate these funds and begin the test program.

Because of the suitability of the C-131 for certain Air Guard units and because of the need to increase the C-131s performance and reliability, the committee directs the Air Force to proceed with the reengining and modification of an additional 3 C-131 aircraft.

The committee authorizes $12 million for this purpose.

The committee also directs the office of the Secretary of Defense to report on the status of the C-131 fleet within two months of the passage of this Act. The report shall address the committee's concern that the C-131 aircraft should not be retired without a clear rationale if the aircraft are in good condition, and that a rational redistribution plan be developed to ensure that C-131 aircraft are retained by or distributed to the units for which they are best suited. This report shall also be utilized to select the 3 aircraft which the committee has authorized to be reengined in fiscal year 1986.

DOD MUNITIONS ACQUISITION PLAN

During the past 4 years munitions sustainability for each of the services has improved significantly. Nonetheless, sustainability stocks—especially for "threat-based" munitions such as air-to-air missiles, torpedos, sonobuoys, etc.—continue to fall short of requirements. In recognition of these shortfalls, the committee has made a concerted effort to support munitions programs at the levels requested by the administration.

The committee's hearings in review of the fiscal year 1986 defense budget, made it clear that there is a need for a systematic, DoD-wide master plan for the development and procurement of munitions. This requirement will become even more crucial in the future as budget pressures pit against each other the priorities of force modernization, readiness and sustainability.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive analysis of threat-based munitions and related expendables, with the objective of developing a master plan that will establish an overall OSD acquisition strategy for these weapons. The master plan should include, among other things, the funding levels required over the next 5 years for each type of munition to achieve the sustainability goals outlined in the Defense Guidance; the extent to which those goals will be reached in the fiscal year 1987 5 year plan; and the extent to which those goals will be achieved in the 5 year plan if the overall defense budget is constrained to 3 percent real growth.

The master plan shall also document the progress the Defense Department is making toward standardizing the disparate planning and programming procedures utilized by the services. This plan shall be submitted no later than February 1, 1986.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS

The administration requested authority to enter multi-year contracts for the procurement of 12 systems, 8 of which are defined as major systems. The following is a list of programs proposed for multi-year contracts and the projected savings when compared with annual contracts:

Projected Savings

	Percent [1]
Major Systems:	
T-700 Series Engine	10.0
M-1A1 Tank Chassis	9.5 (9.2)
M-1 AGT 1500 Turbine Engine	12.5 (12.9)
M-1 LRF & TIS Fire Control Components	14.5 (15.7)
LHD	20.4
MK-46 Torpedo and Modification Kits	9.3
M-9 Armored Combat Earthmover (ACE)	7.0
P-3C	8.7
Minor Systems:	
M-1 Computer Electronic Unit & Control Panel Components	14.5 (13.9)
Bradley Fighting Vehicle System Transmission	8.9
M-60 Tank Thermal Sight	17.2
M-939 5-Ton Truck	6.5

[1] For M-1 tank subsystems two levels are shown: the first represents the savings at a production rate of 840 tanks per year, the second at 720 tanks per year.

The committee has consistently supported multi-year contracting as a means to achieve program savings and stability. The experience thus far with multi-year programs has been favorable. In virtually every program that has been approved for multi-year funding, substantial savings over annual contract costs have been realized and program stability has been dramatically increased. The success of these efforts stands in sharp contrast to the rampant cost growth and program turmoil that characterized many Defense Department programs during the late 1970s.

The committee notes that when the administration first proposed multi-year contracting, savings were estimated between 10 and 20 percent. The committee has previously indicated that it considers 10 percent to be a minimum acceptable level of savings. Therefore, in view of the success of previous multi-year contracts, the committee recommends approval of the administration's request to enter multi-year obligations for the T-700 Series Engine, M-1A1 Tank Chassis, M-1 AGT 1500 Turbine Engine, M-1 LRF & TIS Fire Control Components, M-1 Computer Electronic Unit & Control Panel Components, Bradley Fighting Vehicle System Transmission, M-60 Tank Thermal Sight, LHD, and MK-46 Torpedo and Modification Kits, but only if the actual negotiated savings meets or exceeds 10 percent.

The committee recommends disapproval of the administration's request to enter multi-year contracts for the procurement of the P-3C aircraft and M-9 Armored Combat Earthmover (ACE).

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

BACKGROUND ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION

Annual authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test and evaluation conducted by the Department of Defense has been required by law since 1963 (Public Law 88-174). Appropriate subcommittees of the full committee conducted hearings and reviewed information on various research and development program requests including, but not limited to, the following: Army general purpose programs; the MX program and ballistic missile defense; tactical and strategic aircraft and associated systems; Army anti-tank weapons and electronic warfare; the Trident and various other submarine programs; new ships and related ship programs; lasers and particle beam technology; strategic command, control and communications (C^3); chemical warfare matters; and various land, air, and sea-launched cruise missile systems. The committee recommendations appear in subsequent pages of this report.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED FUNDING CHANGES

The table below shows comparisons of the amounts appropriated for research, development, test and evaluation for fiscal year 1985 with the amounts requested for authorization in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986 and those recommended by the committee.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTMENTS TO FISCAL YEAR 1986 RDT&E AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

[Dollar amounts in millions; totals may not add due to rounding]

	Fiscal year 1985 budget authority	Fiscal year 1986 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
Army	$4,376.1	$5,279.9	−$323.7	$4,956.2
Navy-Marine Corps	9,274.1	11,264.3	−485.7	10,778.6
Air Force	13,506.3	15,578.5	−616.9	14,961.6
Defense Agencies	4,307.2	7,157.4	−336.2	6,821.2
Total	31,463.8	39,280.1	−1,762.5	37,517.6

OVERSIGHT OF RESEARCH, EXPLORATORY, AND ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT

The committee has noted with dismay the increasing proliferation of line items and separate projects within line items within the technology base and advanced technology development accounts. The hundreds of line items and multiple projects encourages the very micro-management by the Congress that DoD decries. More importantly, such a proliferation fails to provide a vehicle by which the Congress can provide broad oversight to the relative weight of R&D effort across mission areas and among promising technologies.

The department is strongly encouraged to take immediate steps to restructure the manner in which these programs are presented to the Congress for consideration. The committee will expect significant progress along these lines by the time of the fiscal year 1987 budget submission. At a minimum, the committee will expect a reduction in the overall number of line items in these research and development categories, and the committee serves notice that it will look unfavorably on "new starts."

TACTICAL COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS (C3) INTEROPERABILITY

The committee has taken a strong interest in the interoperability of tactical communications equipment among the four services as well as with our allies. During the committee's review of the fiscal year 1986 defense budget request, several instances were cited in which tactical communications systems were determined not to be interoperable.

It was also discovered that the DoD Directive (DoDD 4630.5) dealing with tactical communications interoperability has not been revised for 18 years.

It is the opinion of the committee that the Defense Department should focus increased attention on this problem to ensure the achievement of the maximum practicable level of interoperability for tactical communications systems.

The committee directs that no funds authorized for the procurement of tactical communications equipment shall be obligated or expended until the Secretary of Defense submits to the Congress an updated revision of DoDD 4630.5 dealing with the interoperability of tactical communications systems.

Copies of the correspondence between the chairman of the committee and the Office of the Secretary of Defense addressing this issue are reproduced herein.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 27, 1985.

Honorable Barry Goldwater,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 14, 1985 regarding Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 4630.5. I have asked the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence (ASD C3I), Mr. Donald C. Latham, to take immediate action to update and publish that directive. As promised by Assistant Secretary Latham and Lt. General C. E. McKnight, Jr. in a hearing before your Committee on March 14, work has already begun. The effort will involve all affected departments and agencies from the start. With this cooperative approach, we should be able to complete, staff, and publish the new DoDD 4630.5 in very short order.

In the meantime, we are not without current policy guidance in the C3 interoperability area. There are many policy documents that provide guidance in specific portions of the electromagnetic spectrum, functional areas, applications, procedures, etc. For example, there are several Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) documents, some as recent as last year, that provide policies and guidance relative to the Joint Interoperability of Tactical Command and Control Systems (JINTACCS) program, one of our major, current interoperability efforts. Also, the charter for the Joint Tactical Command, Control and Communications Agency (JTC3A) (DoDD 5154.28, dated July 5, 1984) includes specific responsibilities regarding interoperability for the JCS, the Commands of the Unified and Specified Commands, the Services and the Agencies, as well as for the JTC3A.

Nevertheless, you are quite correct in pointing out that the "capstone" policy document for interoperability is unacceptably outdated. I can assure you that we are correcting the situation, and that the Services, Agencies, JCS, ASD(C3I), and my staff will cooperate fully to write a sound policy directive and publish it as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

William H. Taft IV,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

United States Senate,
Committee on Armed Services,
Washington, DC, March 14, 1985.

Honorable Caspar Weinberger,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC 20301.

Dear Cap: In our hearing today examining joint Service communications and electronic warfare programs, Senator Warner brought up the fact that the Department of Defense directive (Number 4630.5) dealing with the interoperability of tactical communications equipment, has not been updated since January 28, 1967. I understand that attempts have been made periodically to revise this document but each time those efforts have been frustrated by the Pentagon bureaucracy.

It seems to me that as long as I have been involved with military communications, we have had problems communicating among the various Services. We had problems communicating with each other in World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and even in the recent Grenada operation. I don't see how we can ever expect the Services to fight together--and I mean on the same side--and communicate together, if we can't even get them to agree on a directive establishing the Department's policy toward ensuring interoperability.

If necessary, the Senate Armed Services Committee is willing to consider a legislative restriction on the expenditure of any funds for communications equipment until meaningful progress is made toward resolving these bureaucratic problems. This letter is intended to give each of the Services fair notice that they are going to have to overcome their parochial differences or else their programs may not be funded. It seems to me a good place to start would be updating DoD Directive Number 4630.5.

With best wishes,

Barry Goldwater,
Chairman.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION
ARMY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		TECHNOLOGY BASE			
1	61101A	IN-HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	25.280		25.280
2	61102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	236.869		236.869
3	61103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	6.126		6.126
4	62105A	MATERIALS	12.380		12.380
5	62111A	ATMOSPHERIC INVESTIGATIONS	6.896		6.896
6	62120A	NUCLEAR WEAPONS EFFECTS/FLUIDICS	8.461		8.461
7	62122A	SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENT	[ ]		[ ]
8	62201A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	3.321		3.321
9	62202A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS TECHNOLOGY	9.766		9.766
10	62209A	AERONAUTICAL TECHNOLOGY	31.171		31.171
11	62210A	AIRDROP TECHNOLOGY	2.061		2.061
12	62303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	31.504		31.504
13	62307A	LASER WEAPON TECHNOLOGY	21.392		21.392
14	62601A	TANK AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	22.226		22.226
15	62603A	LARGE CAL AND NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY	[ ]	-4.000	-4.000
16	62617A	SMALL CAL AND FIRE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	12.794		12.794
17	62618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	48.424		48.424
18	62622A	CHEMICAL AND SMOKE MUNITIONS	14.062		14.062
19	62623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM (JSSAP)	6.542		6.542
20	62701A	COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	21.403		21.403
21	62703A	COMBAT SURVEIL TARGET ACQUIS AND IDENT	4.407		4.407
22	62704A	MILILITARY ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA DEV	3.096		3.096
23	62705A	ELECTRICAL AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	22.871		22.871
24	62706A	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE/GEN INVEST	41.724		41.724
25	62707A	MAPPING--GEODESY	10.364		10.364
26	62709A	NIGHT VISION INVESTIGATIONS	22.077		22.077
27	62715A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	[ ]		[ ]
28	62716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING SYSTEM DEV	15.269		15.269
29	62717A	HUMAN PERFORMANCE EFFECT/SIMULATION	6.788		6.788
30	62719A	MOBILITY AND WEAPONS EFFECTS TECHNOLOGY	13.363		13.363
31	62720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	8.912		8.912
32	62722A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING	8.016		8.016
33	62723A	CLOTHING EQUIPMENT AND SHELTER TECH	10.537		10.537
34	62724A	JT SERVICE FOOD SYSTEM TECH	6.432		6.432
35	62725A	COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE	2.216		2.216
36	62727A	NONSYSTEMS TRAINING DEVICES TECH (NSTD)	5.103		5.103
37	62730A	COLD REGIONS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	6.819		6.819
38	62731A	MILITARY FACILITIES ENGINEERING TECH	5.253		5.253
39	62733A	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT TECHNOLOGY	13.627		13.627
40	62734A	MEDICAL DEFENSE AGAINST CHEMICAL AGENTS	32.309		32.309
41	62746A	TACTICAL ADP TECHNOLOGY	9.066		9.066
42	62770A	MILITARY DISEASE HAZARDS TECHNOLOGY	28.990		28.990
43	62772A	COMBAT CASUALTY CARE TECHNOLOGY	8.892		8.892
44	62775A	COMBAT MAXILLOFACIAL INJURY	2.167		2.167
45	62777A	SYSTEMS HEALTH HAZARD PREVENTION TECH	19.461		19.461
46	62781A	ENERGY TECH APPLICATIONS FOR MIL FACILITIES	2.230		2.230
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	45.765		45.765
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	876.432	-4.000	872.432

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
47	63102A	MATERIALS AND STRUCTURES ADV DEV	14.437		14.437
48	63104A	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS ADV DEV	3.384		3.384
49	63201A	A/C POWER PLANTS AND PROPULSION	21.833		21.833
50	63206A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS	6.946		6.946
51	63207A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT	10.970		10.970
53	63211A	ROTARY WING CONTROLS/ROTORS/STRUCTURES	31.104	-13.700	17.404
54	63216A	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT SIMULATORS DEVELOPMENT	12.613		12.613
55	63218A	AIRDROP ADVANCEMENT	3.854		3.854
57	63221A	NOE AVIATION AND NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	3.089		3.089
58	63226A	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	[ ]	-10.000	-10.000
59	63306A	TERMINALLY GUIDED PROJECTILES	17.409		17.409
60	63313A	MISSILE/ROCKET COMPONENTS	42.836		42.836
62	63322A	BATTLEFIELD ENVIRONMENT SIMULATION	2.570		2.570
63	63324A	ARMY DEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITY	9.705		9.705
64	63602A	ADVANCED LAND MOBILITY SYSTEMS CONCEPTS	16.474		16.474
65	63606A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER DEVELOPMENT	11.267		11.267
66	63607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM (JSSAP)	3.463		3.463
67	63621A	COMBAT VEHICLE PROPULSION SYSTEM	14.967		14.967
68	63631A	COMBAT VEHICLE TURRET AND CHASSIS SUBSYS	17.036		17.036
69	63636A	COMBAT VEHICLE ARMOR/ANTI-ARMOR	11.363		11.363
70	63637A	ADV PROPULSION/LAUNCH SYSTEM FOR MUNITIONS	8.233		8.233
72	63640A	AMMUNITION LOGISTICS	2.035		2.035
73	63710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	33.622		33.622
74	63723A	TAC COMM/COMM/COMPUTER (C4) INTEGRATION	31.774		31.774
76	63731A	MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL	16.938		16.938
77	63734A	ENGINEERING SYSTEMS	3.450		3.450
78	63736A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING APPLICATIONS	1.961		1.961
79	63737A	ANTI-RADIATION MISSILE COUNTERMEASURES	[ ]		[ ]
80	63739A	HUMAN FACTORS IN TRAINING/OPER EFFECT	11.511		11.511
81	63742A	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC DEVICES DEVELOPMENT	9.730		9.730
82	63743A	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	11.846		11.846
83	63744A	TRAINING SIMULATION	5.494		5.494
84	63748A	TEST MEASUREMENT AND DIAG EQUIPMENT DEV	7.235		7.235
85	63749A	TECHNICAL VULNERABILITY REDUCTION	4.305		4.305
86	63752A	DEMILITARIZATION CONCEPTS	9.575		9.575
87	63756A	DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVES (STARS)	52.000	-15.000	37.000
88	63758A	TACTICAL ROBOTIC SYSTEMS	26.496	-10.000	16.496
89	63759A	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE/SMK ADV TECH DEMOS	3.045		3.045
90	63761A	EW VULNER/SUSCEPTABILITY TECH SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
91	63762A	EW FEASIBILITY DEVELOPMENTLITY DEVELOPME	8.643		8.643
92	63763A	NONSYSTEMS MEDICAL MATERIAL DEVELOPMENT	16.221		16.221
93	63764A	MEDICAL/CHEM DEFENSE LIFE SUPPORT MATERIAL	22.612		22.612
94	63765A	NONTACTICAL ADP TECHNOLOGY	0.218		0.218
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	51.084		51.084
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	593.348	-48.700	544.648
		STRATEGIC PROGRAMS			
97	12814A	SPECIAL PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
98	12821A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]	-6.000	-6.000
99	33152A	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM	30.914		30.914
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	204.743		204.743
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	235.657	-6.000	229.657

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		TACTICAL PROGRAMS			
100	63209A	AIR MOBILITY SUPPORT	15.472		15.472
101	63215A	JOINT SURVIVABILITY INVESTIGATIONS	0.900		0.900
103	63220A	ADVANCED ROTORCRAFT TECH INTEGRATION (LHX)	75.528	-20.000	55.528
104	63225A	AIRDROP EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	1.877		1.877
105	63302A	ANTI-TACTICAL MISSILE (ATM)	62.760		62.760
106	63303A	SURF-TO-SURF MISSILE ROCKET SYSTEM	30.622		30.622
107	63604A	NUCLEAR MUNITIONS AND RADIACS	[ ]		[ ]
108	63608A	WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION	0.798		0.798
109	63612A	ADVANCED ANTI-TANK WEAPON	81.077	-10.000	71.077
110	63615A	LETHAL CHEMICAL MUNITIONS CONCEPTS	20.387		20.387
111	63619A	LANDMINE/BARRIER SYSTEM	28.424	-2.800	25.624
112	63627A	SMOKE MUNITIONS AND MATERIEL CONCEPTS	12.672		12.672
113	63628A	ARTILLERY/MORTAR AMMO DEVELOPMENT	10.157		10.157
114	63633A	TANK/FIGHTING VEHICLE AMMO DEVELOPMENT	5.734		5.734
115	63635A	MOBILE PROTECTED GUN PROGRAM	9.802	-9.802	0.000
116	63639A	ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITATIVE (AEI)	[ ]		[ ]
117	63641A	PROGRAM 292	[ ]	-20.000	-20.000
118	63702A	ELECTRIC POWER SOURCES	11.258		11.258
119	63705A	PHYSICAL SECURITY	4.416		4.416
120	63706A	IFF EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	20.693		20.693
121	63709A	COMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT	[ ]		[ ]
123	63711A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	8.611		8.611
124	63713A	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS)	38.016		38.016
125	63718A	EW VULNERABILITY/SUCEPTABILITY	23.791		23.791
126	63720A	CHEM/BIO DETECTION WARM/SAMP MAT CONCEPT	15.192		15.192
127	63721A	CHEM/BIO PROTECTIVE MATERIEL CONCEPTS	9.341		9.341
129	63725A	REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES/DRONES	20.977		20.977
130	63726A	COMBAT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	28.363		28.363
131	63726A	COMBAT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	[ ]		[ ]
132	63732A	COMBAT MEDICAL MATERIAL	9.379		9.379
134	63745A	TAC ELETRONIC SUPPORT MEASURE SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
135	63746A	SINGLE CHANNEL GRD/ABN RADIO SUB-SYSTEM	2.265		2.265
136	63747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT/SURVIVABILITY	6.657		6.657
137	63750A	DRUG AND VACCINE DEVELOPMENT	16.932		16.932
138	63751A	MEDICAL DEFENSE AGAINST CHEMICAL WARFARE	31.019		31.019
139	63754A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (ADV)	[ ]		[ ]
140	63755A	TAC ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
142	64202A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS	[ ]		[ ]
143	63767A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM	0.980		0.980
144	64202A	AIRCRAFT WEAPONS	12.672		12.672
145	64204A	AIR MOBILITY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2.600		2.600
147	64207A	ADVANCED ATTACK HELICOPTER (AH-64)	17.506		17.506
148	64216A	AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEMS	70.791		70.791
149	64217A	SYNTHETIC FLIGHT TRAINING SYSTEMS	7.863		7.863
150	64218A	AIRDROP EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	3.141		3.141
151	64220A	ARMY HELICOPTER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	6.802		6.802
153	64268A	AIRCRAFT COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	16.158		16.158
154	64306A	STINGER	18.583		18.583
155	64307A	PATRIOT (SAM-D)	53.070		53.070
156	64310A	HELIBORNE MISSILE (HELLFIRE)	6.213		6.213
158	64313A	GRASSBLADE	10.878		10.878
160	64318A	DIVISION AIR DEFENSE GUN	43.176	-37.000	6.176
161	64321A	JT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
163	64324A	JT TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM-ARMY (JTACMS-A)	154.805	-40.000	114.805

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
164	64601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	24.003		24.003
165	64603A	NUCLEAR MUNITIONS	[ ]	-3.000	-3.000
166	64604A	MOBILITY	15.486	-15.486	0.000
167	64609A	SMOKE MUNITIONS AND MATERIEL	6.024		6.024
168	64612A	COUNTERMINE AND BARRIERS	10.417	-4.800	5.617
169	64616A	FIGHTING VEHICLE SYSTEM	2.228		2.228
170	64619A	LANDMINE WARFARE	7.954		7.954
171	64630A	M1 E1 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	3.898		3.898
172	64631A	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION	62.590	-7.800	54.790
173	64632A	105MM TANK AMMUNITION	1.543		1.543
174	64633A	CACTUS PLANT	[ ]	-8.500	-8.500
175	64701A	COMM ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	10.716		10.716
176	64702A	JT TAC INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	12.243		12.243
177	64704A	UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	2.940		2.940
178	64705A	MODULAR INTEGRATED COMM AND NAVIG SYSTEM	5.007		5.007
179	64706A	RADIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	0.664		0.664
181	64710A	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	14.567		14.567
182	64711A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	24.777		24.777
163	64712A	ARMY COMM/CONTROL SYSTEM SYSTEM ENG	9.896		9.896
184	64713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING AND EQUIPMENT	6.461		6.461
185	64714A	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER SOURCES	10.122		10.122
186	64717A	GENERAL COMBAT SUPPORT	14.822		14.822
187	64718A	PHYSICAL SECURITY	6.496		6.496
188	64722A	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	6.611		6.611
189	64723A	SPECIAL PURPOSE DETECTORS	3.256		3.256
190	64724A	CHEM/BIO DETECT WARN AND TRAIN MATERIAL	23.081		23.081
191	64725A	CHEM/BIO PROTECTIVE MATERIEL	15.585		15.585
192	64727A	COMMAND AND CONTROL	5.799		5.799
193	64730A	REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES	30.014	-6.900	23.114
194	64740A	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	[ ]		[ ]
195	64741A	DIVISION AIR DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL	33.040		33.040
196	64746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	21.310		21.310
197	64750A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
198	64751A	SINGLE CHANNEL GRD/ABN RADIO SUB ENG	12.874		12.874
199	64754A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM (ENG)	[ ]		[ ]
200	64757A	MEDICAL CHEMICAL DEFENSE LIFE SUPPORT MAT	7.680		7.680
201	64758A	DRUG AND VACCINE DEVELOPMENT	10.497		10.497
202	64766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	[ ]		[ ]
203	64770A	JT SURVEIL TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	43.818		43.818
204	64779A	JT INTEROP OF TAC CMD & CONT SYS (JINTACCS)	8.381		8.381
205	65710A	JT CB CONTACT POINT TEST AND ASSESSMENT	2.402		2.402
206	23724A	HV ANTI-TANK ASSAULT WEAPON SYSTEM (TOW)	11.836		11.836
207	23726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	35.574		35.574
208	23727A	MED ANTI-TANK ASSAULT WEAPON (H)	3.842		3.842
209	23730A	CHAPARRAL	17.666		17.666
210	23731A	SAM HAWK/HAWK IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	5.212		5.212
211	23735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	72.743		72.743
213	23740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	8.636		8.636
215	23743A	155MM SELF-PROPELLED HOWITZER IMPROVEMENTS	26.105		26.105
217	23745A	EQUIPMENT UPGRADE	30.805		30.805
218	28010A	JT TACTICAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	30.560		30.560
219	33145A	EUCOM C3 SYSTEMS	1.961		1.961
	------	PRIOR YEAR AUTHORIZATION TRANSFER	---		---
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	615.866		615.866
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	2366.366	-186.080	2180.278

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT	TITLE	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS			
220	63712A	MAPPING AND GEODESY	4.205		4.205
221	64201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	2.238		2.238
222	64716A	MAPPING AND GEODESY	3.430		3.430
223	64778A	NAVSTAR GPS (USER EQUIPMENT)	11.271		11.271
224	31307A	FOREIGN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CENTER	[ ]		[ ]
225	31327A	TECH RECONNAISSANCE/SURVEILLANCE (TECRAS)	[ ]		[ ]
226	31334A	OTHER COMMAND GDIP ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
227	31359A	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAMS	[ ]		[ ]
229	33126A	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	4.312		4.312
230	33142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT	26.755	-6.809	19.946
231	33401A	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]		[ ]
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16.280		16.280
		SUBTOTAL, INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	68.491	-6.809	61.682
		DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT			
232	63315A	TARGET MISSILES	6.051		6.051
233	63738A	NONSYSTEMS TRAINING DEVICES (NSTD) DEV	5.863		5.863
234	64715A	NONSYSTEMS TRAINING DEVICES (ENG)	43.636		43.636
235	64726A	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	6.447		6.447
236	65201A	AVIATION ENGINEERING FLIGHT ACTIVITY	11.720		11.720
237	65301A	KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE	161.624		161.624
239	65702A	SUPPORT OF DEVELOPMENT TESTING	58.671		58.671
240	65706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	15.930		15.930
241	65709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3.569		3.569
242	65712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	54.855		54.855
243	65716A	THREAT SIMULATORS FOR TESTING	36.149		36.149
244	65801A	PROGRAM-WIDE ACTIVITIES	183.766	-15.000	168.766
245	65802A	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE R&D	0.947		0.947
246	65803A	TECHNICAL INFO ACTIVITIES	6.265		6.265
247	65804A	DARCOM MAJOR RANGE/TEST FACILITY	373.054	-15.000	358.054
248	65805A	MUNITIONS--NATO STDZN DOD EFFEC SAFETY STDS	11.626		11.626
249	65806A	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER SYSTEMS TEST FACILITY	20.184		20.184
251	65872A	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	23.335		23.335
252	65898A	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (R&D)	11.852	-2.000	9.852
253	78011A	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	104.062	-12.000	92.062
		SUBTOTAL, DEF-WIDE MISSION SUPPORT	1139.606	-44.000	1095.606
		RESTORATION OF CIVILIAN PAY REDUCTION	---	33.600	33.600
		CIVILIAN END STRENGTH FREEZE	---	-61.700	-61.700
		TOTAL, ARMY RDT&E	5279.900	-323.697	4956.203

ROTARY WING CONTROLS/ROTORS/STRUCTURES

The administration requested $31.1 million for research and development of Army rotary wing controls, rotors, and related structures. Under project D-313 of this program element, the administration proposed to build and flight test a heavy lift rotary vehicle (HLRV) for research purposes. This program would employ assets from the XCH-62 heavy lift helicopter (HLH) program which was terminated by the Congress in 1975 due to a lack of procurement funds.

In 1985, there are still no funds to take the HLH into production. Faced with the current budgetary environment, the committee cannot justify further expenditures on the evaluation of the HLH.

The committee recommends an authorization of $17.4 million for the Army's Rotary Wing Controls program, a reduction of $13.7 million from the request.

LHX

The administration requested $75.5 million for the development of a family of light helicopters (LHX) designed to replace the Army's aging inventory of UH-1, AH-1, OH-58 and OH-6 helicopters. Under this program the Army would develop and procure approximately 4,800 LHXs to replace approximately 7,000 existing helicopters.

The committee recognizes the requirement to modernize the inventory of Army helicopters, however, the committee remains concerned over the projected cost of the program. In the committee report (Senate Report 98-500) accompanying the fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization bill, the committee noted that the LHX program would be the largest and most expensive helicopter program ever undertaken by the Defense Department. At that time the estimated development cost of the program was $3 billion and the estimated procurement cost was just over $30 billion. Because the program was just entering the concept definition stage, those estimates were recognized as imprecise. During the Army's testimony in support of fiscal year 1986 programs new estimates were provided for the development and procurement costs of the LHX, $4 billion and $40 billion respectively.

While recognizing that one of the principal objectives of the LHX program is to develop an aircraft with modest O&S (Operations and Support) costs, the committee nevertheless remains concerned over the affordability of the program in the face of increasing budgetary constraints. It is unfortunate but true that in times of severe budgetary pressure significant long term economies are often sacrificed to achieve relatively minor near term savings.

The committee believes it may be necessary to forego some of the more ambitious objectives of the LHX program (such as achieving substantial commonality among utility/attack/scout helicopters) and instead, accomplish some of the modernization by upgrading or modifying existing helicopters such as the UH-60, or AH-64. Consideration should also be given to militarizing available commercial helicopters to meet Army requirements.

The committee directs the Army to provide a report no later than February 1, 1986 which details the projected development and procurement costs of the LHX, and identifies existing helicopters which might perform some of the LHX's proposed missions. This report should address the cost of proceeding with alternative aircraft along with the ability of those aircraft to perform the projected LHX missions.

The committee recommends an authorization of $55.5 million for development of the LHX.

ANTI-TACTICAL MISSILE

The administration requested $62.7 million for the Army's Anti-Tactical Missile (ATM) development program. The ATM program is designed to provide existing air defense systems with a self-protection capability against short range tactical missiles. The committee supports this effort.

The committee notes that the ATM program is not designed to provide capability against strategic ballistic missiles and that research, development and testing in this program is fully consistent with the ABM Treaty of 1972. This is consistent with this committee's intent.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the Anti-Tactical Missile program.

AIRCRAFT PROPULSION SYSTEMS

The administration requested $70.8 million for the development of the T-800 Advanced Technology (1,200 shaft horse power class) engine intended for use in the Army's new light helicopter family (LHX).

While the committee has recommended a reduction in the administration's request for the development of the LHX, it nevertheless believes that the development of the T-800 advanced technology engine should proceed as requested by the administration.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for $70.8 million for the development of the T-800 advanced technology engine.

JOINT TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM—ARMY (JTACMS–A)

The administration requested $154.8 million for the development of the Army's Joint Tactical Missile System (JTACMS-A). The JTACMS-A is an improved conventional weapon system designed to attack high value targets at ranges beyond the capability of cannons and rockets. This program also includes the development of an infra-red (IR) terminally guided submunition (TGSM) which is expected to enhance the lethality of the JTACMS-A.

In fiscal year 1985, the Congress appropriated $76.4 million for the development of the Army's JTACMS. Of this amount, the committee has learned that $40 million remains unobligated. These funds are available to bring forward to fiscal year 1986, thereby permitting an identical reduction to be made in the fiscal year 1986 program request.

The committee therefore recommends an authorization of $114.8 million, a reduction of $40 million from the administration's request for the development of JTACMS–A.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)

The administration requested $43.8 million for Army research and development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS). The JSTARS is a joint Army and Air Force program designed to develop an airborne engagement system to detect and track moving formations of enemy surface units and to guide accurate attacks against moving or fixed ground targets. The committee continues to strongly support the development of the standoff targeting capability envisioned for the JSTARS program. (See discussion of JSTARS in Air Force research and development section.)

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION
NAVY

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		TECHNOLOGY BASE			
1	61103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6.250		6.250
2	61152N	IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LAB RESEARCH	26.277		26.277
3	61153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	339.176	-2.250	336.926
4	62101N	TACTICAL DIRECTED ENERGY TECH	10.834		10.834
5	62241N	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	23.102		23.102
6	62331N	MISSILE PROPULSION TECH	10.503		10.503
7	62332N	SURF/AEROSPACE WEAPONRY TECH	27.218		27.218
8	62542N	NUCLEAR PROPULSION TECH	49.018		49.018
9	62543N	SHIP AND SUBMARINE TECH	25.272		25.272
10	62633N	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECH	44.181		44.181
11	62711N	UNDERSEA TARGET SURV TECH	44.495		44.495
12	62712N	SURF/AEROSPACE TARGET SURV TECH	32.240		32.240
13	62721N	COMMAND AND CONTROL TECH	28.943		28.943
14	62734N	COUNTERMEASURES TECH	27.005		27.005
15	62744N	MC AIR-GROUND TECHNOLOGY	18.499		18.499
16	62757N	HUMAN FACTORS AND SIM TECH	7.652		7.652
17	62758N	BIOMEDICAL TECH	8.906		8.906
18	62759N	OCEAN AND ATMOS SUPT TECH	27.095		27.095
19	62760N	LOGISTICS TECH	13.311		13.311
20	62761N	MATERIALS TECH	33.004		33.004
21	62762N	ELEX DEVICE TECH	24.898		24.898
22	62763N	PERSONNEL AND TRAINING TECH	5.062		5.062
23	62764N	CHEMICAL/BIO/RADIOLOGICAL DEFENSE TECH	4.765		4.765
25	62766N	LAB INDEPENDENT EXPLORATORY DEV	15.463		15.463
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	853.169	-2.250	850.919
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
27	63202N	AVIONICS	4.909		4.909
28	63207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	8.946		8.946
29	63210N	ADV A/C PROPULSION SYSTEM	8.841		8.841
30	63216N	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	1.377		1.377
31	63217N	ADV A/C SUBSYSTEMS	4.684		4.684
32	63303N	ERASE	10.149		10.149
33	63306N	ASM TECH	8.973	-8.973	0.000
35	63508N	SHIP PROPULSION SYS (ADV)	30.664		30.664
36	63526N	ADVANCED COMPUTER TECH	14.555	-3.341	11.214
37	63573N	ELECTRIC DRIVE	9.762		9.762
38	63609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	30.334	-2.000	28.334
39	63654N	JOINT SERVICE EOD DEVELOPMENT (ADV)	10.898		10.898
40	63701N	HUMAN FACTORS ENG DEVEL	2.116		2.116
41	63704N	ASW OCEANOGRAPHY	6.376		6.376
42	63706N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT (ADV)	14.653	-4.000	10.653
43	63707N	MANPOWER CONTROL SYSTEM DEV	4.099	-1.000	3.099
44	63709N	ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM	5.477		5.477
45	63712N	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D	8.886	-8.886	0.000
46	63713N	OCEAN ENG TECH DEVELOPMENT	13.083		13.083

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
47	63720N	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	4.667	-0.500	4.167
48	63721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	8.347		8.347
49	63722N	NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE	11.862		11.862
52	63732M	ADVANCED MANPOWER TRAINING SYSTEM	6.144		6.144
53	63733N	TRAINING DEVICE TECH	8.679		8.679
54	63739N	NAVAL LOGISTICS PRODUCTIVITY	0.968		0.968
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	239.449	-28.700	210.749
		STRATEGIC PROGRAMS			
56	63451N	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	14.002	-14.002	0.000
61	64363N	TRIDENT II	2165.615		2165.615
62	65856N	STRATEGIC TECH SUPPORT	3.882		3.882
63	11221N	FBM SYSTEM	33.550		33.550
64	11224N	SSBN SECURITY PROGRAM	38.591		38.591
65	11228N	TRIDENT I	47.195	-15.000	32.195
66	11401N	ELF COMMUNICATIONS	28.283		28.283
67	11402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	125.839		125.839
68	12427N	NAV SPASUR	0.954		0.954
69	33131N	MEECN	1.615		1.615
70	33152N	WIS MODERNIZATION	22.504	-5.000	17.504
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	2482.030	-34.002	2448.028
		TACTICAL PROGRAMS			
71	63206N	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	61.587		61.587
72	63208N	145-TS	114.128		114.128
76	63228N	CV ASW MODULE	5.022	-0.763	4.259
77	63251N	A/C SYSTEMS (ADV)	5.894		5.894
78	63254N	AIR ASW	6.778		6.778
79	63256N	JVX	603.743		603.743
80	63257N	A-6E IMPROVEMENTS	237.952		237.952
82	63260N	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	14.148		14.148
83	63261N	TACTICAL AIR RECONNAISSANCE	6.906		6.906
84	63262N	A/C SURVIVABILITY AND VULNERABILITY	14.825		14.825
87	63315N	RETRACT YELLOW	25.728	-20.728	5.000
88	63318N	ADVANCED SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE (ASAM)	41.510		41.510
89	63320N	LOW-COST ANTI-RADIATION SEEKER	16.523		16.523
90	63367N	SUBMARINE ASW STANDOFF WEAPON	75.328	-11.000	64.328
91	63382N	BGAAWC	11.183		11.183
92	63502N	SURFACE MCM	24.908		24.908
93	63504N	SUB SONAR DEVELOPMENT (ADV)	22.414	-1.317	21.097
94	63506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	45.199		45.199
96	63512N	CATAPULTS	3.418		3.418
97	63513N	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMP DEVELOPMENT	21.427	-5.000	16.427
98	63514N	SHIPBOARD DAMAGE CONTROL	32.320		32.320
101	63519N	ADVANCED COMMAND DATA SYSTEM	2.595	-2.595	0.000
102	63522N	SUB ARCTIC WARFARE/SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PR	9.748		9.748
103	63525N	PILOT FISH	93.964		93.964
104	63528N	NON-ACOUSTIC ASW	22.104		22.104
105	63529N	ADVANCED ASW TARGET	12.646		12.646
106	63532N	SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING STANDARDS	4.673	-0.673	4.000
107	63536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	25.368		25.368
109	63542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	3.585	-1.389	2.196

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
110	63550N	LINK DOGWOOD	26.247		26.247
111	63553N	SURFACE ASW	17.649		17.649
112	63560N	SUB HULL ARRAY DEV (ADV)	13.206		13.206
113	63561N	ADVANCED SUB SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	180.586		180.586
114	63562N	SUB TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM (ADV)	23.171		23.171
115	63564N	SHIP DEVELOPMENT (ADV)	14.639		14.639
116	63565N	SURFACE SHIP NAVIGATION SYSTEM	2.841		2.841
118	63569N	ATTACK SUBMARINE DEVELOPMENT	33.139		33.139
119	63570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR REACTOR COMP SYSTEM DEV	120.175		120.175
120	63571N	SHIPBOARD PHYSICAL SECURITY	3.703		3.703
121	63576N	CHALK EAGLE	68.783		68.783
122	63578N	A4W/A1G NUCLEAR PROPULSION PLANT	3.327		3.327
123	63582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	22.383		22.383
124	63589N	DDG-51	100.836		100.836
125	63591N	JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS	132.348		132.348
126	63601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	1.964		1.964
127	63610N	ALWT (ADV)	10.113		10.113
128	63611M	MC ASSAULT VEHICLES	10.407		10.407
129	63634N	TACTICAL NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT	9.721		9.721
130	63635M	GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT ARMS SYSTEM	17.129		17.129
131	63702N	OCEAN ENGINEERING SYSTEM DEV	1.380		1.380
133	63708N	ANTI SUBMARINE WARFARE SIGNAL PROC	15.535		15.535
134	63711N	FLEET TACTICAL D&E PROGRAM	3.880		3.880
135	63717N	COMMAND & CONTROL SYS (ADV)	42.973	-11.000	31.973
136	63719N	CONTAINER OFFLOAD AND TRANSFER SYSTEM	1.515		1.515
137	63724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM (ADV)	18.576		18.576
138	63725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	7.279		7.279
139	63726N	MERSHIP NAVY AUXILIARY PROGRAM	6.031		6.031
140	63729M	COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT (ADV)	9.356		9.356
141	63730M	MC INTEL/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEM	0.070		0.070
142	63734N	CHALK CORAL	3.039		3.039
144	63737N	LINK HAZEL	23.564		23.564
145	63740N	LINK LAUREL	35.345		35.345
146	63743N	ARIADNE	2.185		2.185
147	63744N	LINK SPRUCE	67.352	-37.352	30.000
148	63746N	RETRACT MAPLE	8.247		8.247
149	63763N	NCCS SE&I	7.181		7.181
150	63784N	ASW SURVEILLANCE	19.458		19.458
151	63785N	LRAP	15.678		15.678
152	63787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	49.532		49.532
153	63788N	RDSS	15.380	-15.380	0.000
154	64203N	AVIONICS DEVELOPMENT	14.965		14.965
155	64211N	IFF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	17.477		17.477
156	64212N	LAMPS III	16.006	-1.906	14.100
157	64213N	HELICOPTER DEVELOPMENT	7.902		7.902
158	64214N	AV8B (ENG)	72.078		72.078
159	64215N	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	16.428		16.428
160	64217N	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	15.955		15.955
161	64218N	AIR OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENG	2.468		2.468
162	64219N	AIRBORNE ASW DEVELOPMENT	6.136		6.136
163	64220N	A/C IR SIGN SUPPRESSION	3.945		3.945
164	64221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	48.725	-5.000	43.725
165	64224N	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC WARFARE ENG	62.298		62.298
167	64226N	ASPJ	24.985		24.985
169	64229N	CV IZ ASW HELO	12.722		12.722
170	64252N	A/C PROPULSION (ENG)	44.866		44.866

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
171	64255N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	40.275		40.275
172	64260N	C/MH-53E	2.300		2.300
173	64261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS (ENG)	42.630	-12.000	30.630
174	64264N	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	32.809		32.809
176	64268N	A/C ENGINES COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	65.843		65.843
177	64301N	MK92 FCS UPGRADE	13.326		13.326
178	64303N	AEGIS AREA AIR DEFENSE	11.081		11.081
179	64307N	CG-47 PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	48.506		48.506
180	64308N	LINK ASH	13.636		13.636
181	64314N	AMRAAM	17.051	-8.051	9.000
183	64353N	VERTICAL LAUNCHING SYSTEM	29.566		29.566
184	64354N	AAM SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	13.589		13.589
185	64355N	VLS ASROC	37.444		37.444
186	64358N	CIWS (PHALANX)	7.612		7.612
187	64361N	NATO SEA SPARROW	8.047	-4.000	4.047
188	64365N	SM-2 (N)	9.756		9.756
189	64366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	47.185		47.185
190	64367N	TOMAHAWK	68.798		68.798
191	64369N	5" ROLLING AIR FRAME MISSILE	10.948	-6.000	4.948
192	64370N	SSN-688 VLS	25.699	-15.000	10.699
194	64372N	NEW THREAT UPGRADE	54.034	-54.034	0.000
195	64502N	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS	4.426		4.426
196	64503N	SUB SONAR DEVELOPMENT (ENG)	40.299		40.299
197	64504N	AIR CONTROL ENG	20.335		20.335
198	64506N	BR/CW COUNTERMEASURES	6.079		6.079
199	64507N	EMSP	99.277		99.277
200	64508N	RADAR SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	6.330		6.330
201	64509N	ADVANCED TACTICAL RAD	2.909		2.909
203	64511N	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	0.901		0.901
204	64515N	SUB SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT PROGRAM (ENG)	19.429	-3.000	16.429
205	64516N	SHIP SURVIVABILITY	5.904		5.904
206	64518N	CIC CONVERSION	29.204		29.204
207	64520N	SUB HULL ARRAY DEV (ENG)	25.974		25.974
208	64524N	SUBACS (ENG)	205.205		205.205
211	64562N	SUB TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS (ENG)	49.798	-11.000	38.798
212	64563N	SHIPBOARD PHYSICAL SECURITY (ENG)	4.617		4.617
213	64567N	SHIP SUBSYSTEM DEVELOPMENT/LBTS	89.418	-2.000	87.418
214	64569N	NATO SEA GNAT	2.284		2.284
215	64573N	SHIPBOARD EW IMPROVEMENT	63.776		63.776
216	64574N	TACTICAL EMBEDDED COMPUTER PROGRAM	19.169	-10.000	9.169
217	64575N	AN/SQS-53C	37.713		37.713
218	64578N	LINK BIRCH	4.078		4.078
219	64601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT (ENG)	9.367		9.367
220	64602N	NAVAL GUNNERY IMPROVEMENT	15.870	-8.000	7.870
221	64603N	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	4.678		4.678
223	64608N	SAL GP/EO SENS DEVEL	48.717	-25.800	22.917
224	64609N	BOMB-FUZE IMPROVEMENT	5.672		5.672
225	64610N	MK-50 TORPEDO (ALWT)	158.290		158.290
226	64654N	JOINT SERVICE EOD DEVELOPMENT (ENG)	4.405		4.405
227	64656M	MC ASSAULT VEHICLES	45.653		45.653
228	64657M	GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT ARMS SYSTEM	8.686		8.686
229	64675N	MK-48 ADCAP (ENG)	63.470		63.470
230	64704N	ASW OCEANOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	0.506		0.506
231	64705N	CHALK BANYAN	5.826		5.826
232	64710N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM (ENG)	9.799		9.799
233	64711N	COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEM (ENG)	66.173		66.173

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
234	64713N	TACTAS (AN-SQR-19)	16.200		16.200
236	64715N	SURFACE WARFARE TRAINING DEVELOPMENT	25.821		25.821
238	64717M	COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	3.638		3.638
239	64718M	INTEL/ELECT WARFARE SYSTEM	14.159		14.159
240	64719M	COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	18.906		18.906
242	64725N	REGIONAL TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE	56.225		56.225
243	64761N	INTELLIGENCE (ENG)	12.421	-4.000	8.421
244	64771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT (ENG)	1.380		1.380
245	64779N	JINTACCS	5.622		5.622
246	64780M	JINTACCS MC	2.945		2.945
248	65155N	FLEET TACTICAL D&E	17.197	-2.000	15.197
249	65803N	EMI AND SPECTRUM CONTROL	3.870		3.870
250	65853N	MANAGEMENT AND TECH SUPPORT	11.063	-3.000	8.063
251	65867N	C2 SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	3.979		3.979
252	65871M	MC TACTICAL EXPLOIT NAT CAP	0.415		0.415
253	24134N	A-6 SQUADRONS	19.205		19.205
254	24136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	58.314		58.314
255	24152N	EARLY WARNING AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS	23.666		23.666
256	24161N	AVIATION SUPPORT CVW	1.785		1.785
257	24163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TAC)	72.697	-22.697	50.000
259	24281N	SUBMARINES	3.756		3.756
261	24311N	UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	25.217		25.217
262	24313N	SURTASS	2.186		2.186
263	24571N	SPECIAL PROJECTS	20.513		20.513
264	24573N	NAVY COVER & DECEPTION PROGRAM	25.584		25.584
265	24575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE SUPPORT	8.573		8.573
266	24576N	COUNTER C3 DEVELOPMENT	22.563		22.563
267	25601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	2.636		2.636
268	25604N	JTIDS	184.646		184.646
269	25620N	ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	12.271		12.271
271	25633N	AIRCRAFT EQUIP RELY/MAINTAIN PROGRAM	7.852		
272	25634N	SUBMARINE SILENCING	31.638		31.638
273	25645N	MODULAR GUIDED WEAPON IMPROVEMENT	7.682	-7.682	0.000
274	25658N	LAB FLEET SUPPORT	6.158		6.158
275	25667N	F-14D	348.065		348.065
277	25670N	TACTICAL INTELL PROC SUPPORT	1.456		1.456
278	25674N	EW COUNTER-RESPONSE	80.168		80.168
279	25675N	OPERATIONAL REACTOR DEVELOPMENT	12.719		12.719
280	26313M	MARINE CORPS TELECOMMUNICATIONS	3.587		3.587
281	26623M	GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT ARMS SYSTEM	43.600		43.600
282	26624M	COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	1.449		1.449
283	26625M	INTEL/ELECT WARFARE SYSTEM	1.163		1.163
284	26626M	COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	39.064		39.064
285	26627M	M/C TECH SUPPORT C/C SYSTEM	4.094		4.094
286	28010M	TRI-TAC-MC	11.939		11.939
	------	NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY	0.000	5.900	5.900
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	6160.962	-306.467	5854.495
		INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS			
288	63518N	ADVANCED NAVIGATION DEVELOPMENT	1.941		1.941
289	64514N	NAVIGATION SYSTEMS	0.920		0.920
290	64577N	EHF SATCOM	45.437		45.437
291	64777N	NAVSTAR GPS	70.079	-4.000	66.079

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
292	65866N	C2 SYSTEMS PLAN/ENG SUPPORT	5.466		5.466
293	31303N	FIELD OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE OFFICE	[ ]		[ ]
294	31326N	PRAIRIE SCHOONER	[ ]		[ ]
295	31327N	TECH RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	[ ]		[ ]
296	33109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	17.973		17.973
298	33401N	COMSEC	[ ]		[ ]
299	33603N	MILSTAR JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	4.418		4.418
300	34111N	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]	-50.000	-50.000
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	557.773		557.773
		SUBTOTAL, INTEL AND COMMUNICATIONS	704.007	-54.000	650.007
		DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT			
301	64208N	RANGE INSTRUMENTATION AND SYSTEM DEV	8.382		8.382
302	64258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	109.012		109.012
303	64703N	TRAINING AND PERSONNEL SYSTEM DEVELOPMEN	3.086		3.086
304	65151M	STUDIES AND ANALYSES SUPPORT/MC	1.785		1.785
305	65152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSES SUPPORT/NAVY	3.977		3.977
306	65153M	MCOAG	3.714		3.714
307	65154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSIS/NAVY	21.813	-4.400	17.413
308	65156M	MC OPERATIONAL T&E	2.317		2.317
310	65804N	TECH INFORMATION SERVICES	2.744	-0.500	2.244
311	65852N	AUTEC	51.914	-8.717	43.197
312	65854M	DEVELOPMENT CENTER SUPPORT	3.958		3.958
313	65857N	INTERNATIONAL RDT&E	2.436	-0.600	1.836
314	65859N	MOBILE SEA RANGE	5.268		5.268
315	65861N	RDT&E LAB AND FAC MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	66.278	-9.500	56.778
316	65862N	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION AND MATERIAL SUPPORT	20.321	-1.500	18.821
317	65863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	84.293	-6.000	78.293
318	65864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	294.480		294.480
319	65865N	OT&E CAPABILITY	6.503		6.503
320	65872N	PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENT	2.855	-2.855	0.000
321	35111N	WEATHER SERVICE	1.146		1.146
322	35160N	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM	55.975	-10.000	45.975
323	78011N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	72.426	-17.426	55.000
		SUBTOTAL, DEF-WIDE MISSION SUPPORT	824.683	-61.498	763.185
		RESTORATION OF CIVILIAN PAY REDUCTION	---	3.300	3.300
		CIVILIAN END STRENGTH FREEZE	---	-2.100	-2.100
		TOTAL, NAVY RDT&E	11264.300	-485.717	10778.583

MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY

The administration requested $33.004 million for the Navy's Materials Technology program.

This program funds the development of new materials which may have application to advanced aircraft, ships, missiles, weapons systems, space and other structures.

The committee strongly supports research and development of new materials, especially in areas related to advanced metal matrix composites, carbon-carbon composites and oxidation resistant carbon-carbon composites. The committee recognizes the importance of near term application of these materials to improved combat survivability, hardening, reduced weight and cost, reduced life cycle costs and improved performance.

The committee recommends authorization of $33.004 million for the Materials Technology program and advises that any undistributed reductions should not be applied against it.

COMMONALITY IN AIRCRAFT AVIONICS

Both the Air Force and Navy are planning to develop advanced technology aircraft. The Air Force is developing an Advanced Tactical Fighter (ATF) and the Navy is planning the development of an Advanced Tactical Aircraft (ATA).

In testimony before the committee, the Secretary of the Navy indicated that it is the Navy's goal to achieve 90 percent commonality in the electronics suites of the F-14, A-6, F/A-18 and AV-8B, and that this commonality will save the Navy over $4 billion by the end of the decade. This suggests substantial savings might be achieved from increased commonality in electronic components in future aircraft such as the ATA and ATF. This might be accomplished, either by setting commonality standards for the advanced aircraft with existing inventory aircraft within the services, or by coordinating the development of the Navy's ATA with the Air Force's ATF in the area of electronics. Both systems will be fielded in the mid-1990s, providing ample opportunity for the services to coordinate their efforts to achieve maximum commonality.

The committee encourages the Air Force and Navy to adopt a goal of 90 percent commonality of electronics between the ATF and ATA. The committee directs the services to report on the feasibility of that goal, and on the methods they have incorporated for achieving maximum commonality. The committee intends to use the report to monitor the progress and evaluate the directions taken in these two important programs.

RACER/SURFACE SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM (ADV)

The administration requested $30.664 million for the Surface Ship Propulsion System (advanced) program, which includes $13.479 million for development of RACER (Rankine Cycle Energy Recovery).

RACER is a waste-heat recovery system using steam to achieve greater fuel economy from a gas turbine propulsion system. The DDG-51 is the primary candidate for use of RACER.

The committee has been informed that the RACER program is not meeting schedule and cost objectives. In view of lower petroleum prices and other Navy programs for improving fuel economy, the committee doubts that RACER will be cost effective if certain cost thresholds for development or procurement are exceeded. The committee is funding the program this year to permit continued operational testing of the RACER system and expects the Navy to provide a decision during fiscal year 1986 regarding the wisdom of further development.

The committee recommends authorization of $30.664 million for the Surface Ship Propulsion (advanced) program, as requested.

COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY/TACTICAL EMBEDDED COMPUTERS

The administration requested $14.555 million for the Navy's Advanced Computer Technology program and $19.169 million for the related Navy Tactical Embedded Computer program.

These programs develop standardized computers such as the UYK-43 and UYK-44 and much of the software used for their operation.

The documentation provided to support these requests does not explain how much of this funding is devoted to specific projects, nor does it justify the increased request for funding.

The committee recommends authorization of $11.214 million for the Advanced Computer Technology program, a reduction of $3.341 million, and authorization of $9.169 million for the Navy Tactical Embedded Computer program, which is a reduction of $10 million. This provides approximately the same levels of funding as in fiscal year 1985.

ELECTRIC DRIVE

The administration requested $9.762 million for the Navy's Electric Drive program.

This program develops advanced electric drive systems and electric machinery for Navy ship propulsion. Advantages of electric drive include flexibility in arrangement of ship machinery, ease of maneuvering control, low radiated noise and fuel economy.

Last year, funding for this program was authorized but not appropriated. Funding was in the original budget request, but deleted in the revised budget request. The Navy has not committed funds to this program in fiscal year 1987.

The committee is emphatic in its support for the Electric Drive program. At-sea evaluation of combination electric-drive and gas turbine propulsion plants will provide early results and is a critical step in the evaluation of SWATH hull forms for Navy surface ships. The Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Surface Warfare expressed interest in SWATH ships due to their greater stability and sustained speeds in rough seas, relative to conventional monohull designs.

The committee recommends authorization of $9.762 million for the Electric Drive program.

TRIDENT II MISSILE

The administration requested $2,165.6 million for continued research and development, $312.7 million for procurement of long lead items associated with missile production and $269.3 million for advance procurement for the Trident II missile in fiscal year 1986. (The administration also requested a total of $362.7 for support equipment related to initial deployment of Trident II equipped submarines at Kings Bay, Georgia, and $130.4 million for military construction at Kings Bay.) Initial quantity production of Trident II missiles is expected in fiscal year 1987.

The Trident II missile will carry a larger payload and it will be more accurate than the Trident I missile now deployed. This will provide the United States with a survivable and flexible capability at sea to put at risk hardened Soviet military targets.

The fiscal year 1986 research and development request will support continued full scale engineering development of the Trident II Strategic Weapon System, which includes the missile and guidance systems, as well as submarine equipments such as navigation and fire control that support the missile system. The Trident II missile flight test program is scheduled to begin early in 1987 in order to meet the 1989 initial operational capability of the Trident II weapon system on the ninth Trident submarine.

The committee commends the Navy for reductions from earlier estimates of Trident II cost that have resulted from contract negotiations, and encourages the Navy to seek further reductions, especially in missile procurement costs, in view of anticipated reductions in overall outyear spending levels for defense.

The committee also commends the Navy for the efforts within the Trident II program to protect the option to accommodate a maneuvering reentry body and/or penetration aids in the Trident II payload configuration. These efforts should continue to receive priority attention.

The committee recommends funding the Trident II program at the requested level.

VTX-TS

The administration requested $114.1 million for research and development of the Undergraduate Jet Flight Training System (VTX-TS). The VTX-TS program is intended to develop both a training aircraft (VTX) and training system (TS) which will replace the T-2C and the TA-4J aircraft currently in the Navy's pilot training program.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the VTX-TS program.

JVX (V-22A OSPREY)

The administration requested $603.7 million for the development of a tilt rotor, vertical take off and landing (VTOL) aircraft. The JVX (now designated the V-22A OSPREY) is intended to meet the amphibious/vertical assault needs of the Marine Corps, the combat search and rescue (SAR) requirements of the Navy, and the special operations requirements of the Air Force. Once developed, the JVX may also be procured by the Army to meet medium lift requirements. The JVX will replace the CH-46 and CH-53A/D in the Marine Corps, the HH-3A in the Navy, and will supplement the HH-53, HH-60, and C-130 aircraft in the Air Force. In addition to these military applications, the committee anticipates broad commercial interest in the aircraft.

The committee recommends an authorization of $603.7 million for the development of the JVX.

A-6E IMPROVEMENTS

The administration requested $237.9 million for research and development of the Navy's A-6E medium attack aircraft. The A-6E is a two man, all-weather, carrier based attack aircraft operated by both the Navy and Marine Corps.

In the report (S. 98-500) accompanying the 1985 Senate Defense Authorization Bill, the Senate Armed Services Committee expressed its support for the Navy's plan to enhance the survivability, maintainability and reliability of the A-6E. At the same time, the committee expressed concern that the Navy's focus in this effort had been almost exclusively on new production aircraft, and stressed that consideration should also be given to retrofitting improvements into existing aircraft. Under the current plan, 150 new aircraft will be procured while retrofitting approximately 140.

During 1984, the Navy discovered cracks in the wings of A-6Es. As a consequence, the service life of the A-6Es wings, once estimated to be 4,500 hours, has been revised to 2,250 hours. This has led to the determination that rewinging of the A-6E fleet will be required. While the cost of rewinging has yet to be determined, some estimates exceed $1 billion. In view of this substantial, unanticipated expense, and growing budgetary constraints, the committee believes a careful reevaluation of the A-6E Improvements program is warranted.

The committee notes that the requirements to rewing and modernize the A-6E come at a time when the Navy's overall aviation account (development and procurement) remains underfunded. For years the Navy has not procured enough aircraft to keep pace with attrition and retirement losses. As a consequence, the average force age has continued to grow. Currently the average age of the Navy's aircraft inventory is 12.6 years and rising. The Soviet Union, by comparison, has an average force age of 7 years for its tactical air force.

The committee recognizes the need to modernize the A-6E since it is the Navy's only long range, all-weather strike aircraft. However, the committee does not believe that this effort should enjoy budgetary priority over the need to increase Navy aircraft production rates to levels necessary to arrest and reverse the aging of the inventory. Therefore, the continued support of the committee for this program will be directly influenced by the Navy's ability to reach and maintain the efficient aircraft production levels necessary to accomplish the modernization of the Navy's airwings.

The committee recommends an authorization of $237.9 million for research and development of Navy A-6E Improvements. This recommendation is based on the assumption that a real growth rate of 3 percent in the fiscal year 1986 defense budget will be realized. Should Congress appropriate less, this program will be considered a primary candidate for reduction. Furthermore, as stated in the committee's 1985 report, the committee expects the primary emphasis in this program to remain directed at improving the A-6Es survivability, maintainability, and reliability rather than concentrating on expanding the capabilities of the aircraft.

SUBMARINE ASW STAND-OFF WEAPON

The administration requested $75.328 million for development of the Anti-Submarine Warfare Stand-Off Weapon.

The ASW SOW will be a submarine-launched missile which carries one of two payloads to a designated target area: (1) a conventional anti-submarine lightweight torpedo, such as the Mark-50 ALWT, or (2) a nuclear depth bomb. It is intended as a replacement for the nuclear-only SUBROC (Submarine Rocket). The committee once had the option of funding an extension in the service life of SUBROC and decided against it. SUBROC is now being retired from operational use.

The committee is not happy with continuing reports from the Pentagon that the ASW SOW is represented as a lower priority in the submarine force's funding hierarchy. While acknowledging that priorities must comply with higher DOD guidance, the committee nevertheless relies upon the service for confirmation of relative priorities, when reducing the budget to comply with fiscal constraints.

Last year, authorization for the ASW SOW was reduced by $10 million. This year, Navy witnesses testified in open session that the reduction increased the total cost of the program by $16 million and delayed it by more than one year.

This year, the committee recommends authorization of $64.328 million, which is a reduction of $11 million. Furthermore, the committee advises the Secretary of the Navy that if the ASW SOW is to enjoy continued committee support, it is essential to establish clearly the priority assigned to this costly system. To that end, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to provide a letter to the committee prior to July 1, 1985 or the beginning of conference between the Senate and House of Representatives on this bill (whichever comes first) which identifies the intended date of initial operational capability (IOC) for ASW SOW and affirms his direction to the Navy to fund ASW SOW at the level required to achieve that IOC. Otherwise, the committee is prepared to make a special recommendation in conference that no funding be authorized for this program.

ADVANCED COMMAND DATA SYSTEMS

The administration requested $2.595 million for the Advanced Command Data Systems program.

The purpose of this program was reported to be the development of standard shipboard command data systems hardware, computer programs, and system interaction techniques.

The functions of this program can be absorbed within other Navy RDT&E programs.

The committee recommends no authorization for Advanced Command Data Systems, which is a reduction of the entire $2.595 million.

RDSS

The administration requested $15.38 million for the Rapidly Deployable Surveillance System (RDSS).

This is an anti-submarine warfare sensor system.

The program was cancelled by the Navy earlier this year and then reinstated. The committee believes this program to be of relatively low priority

The committee recommends against authorizing funds for RDSS, a reduction of the entire $15.38 million.

LAMPS MK-III/PENGUIN

The administration requested $16.006 million for the LAMPS MK-III program.

Of the total request, $14.100 is intended for integration of the Penguin anti-ship missile with the LAMPS MK-III aircraft and $1.906 million is intended for improvements to the LAMPS MK-III computer system.

The committee fully supports the Navy's plans to integrate the Penguin missile with the SH-60B helicopter. During hearings this year, the degree of the Navy's commitment to the Penguin was examined. The Navy's witness indicated that after extensive discussion within the service, the Navy has decided to develop and install the capability to launch Penguin anti-ship missiles from SH-60B aircraft.

The committee also supports the Navy's objective of integrating the MK-50 torpedo with the LAMPS MK-III and of improving the system's ability to process acoustic data. However, the Navy has not indicated how it intends to manage the software improvements to the UYS-1 so that commonality with the UYS-2 will be maximized and software support costs will be minimized.

The committee recommends authorization of $14.1 million for the LAMPS MK-III program, a reduction of $1.906 million.

NEW THREAT UPGRADE

The administration requested $54.034 million for the Navy's New Threat Upgrade program.

The improved radar and fire control system developed by this program are now in production. Nevertheless, the funding request for this program continues to increase.

Last year, the committee reduced funding for this program by $3 million because sufficient justification was not provided. The committee also directed the Navy to provide a schedule of events and a funding profile for the remainder of this program, due two weeks after submission of the fiscal year 1986 budget request.

As markup of this bill began, the report was overdue. Other replies by the Navy to other requests for information are also late. The study on naval gunfire alternatives was not available by April 1, 1985. The report on procedures for building diesel-electric submarines, due from the Secretary of Defense on October 1, 1984, was not drafted by the Navy and provided to OSD until March 1, 1985. The plan for modernization and maintenance of the Navy's air ASW forces was due when the fiscal year 1986 budget was submitted and is also overdue.

The committee's formal requests for reports from the Navy are sometimes the result of a compromise between members which is in lieu of reducing the service's request for funds. The Navy's best interest usually lies in timely compliance.

The committee recommends no authorization for the New Threat Upgrade program, a reduction of the entire $54.034. The committee advises the Navy that other reductions in the Navy RDT&E account were influenced by the fact that information requested by the committee was not provided in a timely manner.

SEAFIRE/SAL-GP

The administration requested $48.717 million for the Semi-Active Laser-Guided Projectile/Electro Optics Sensor Development program. This program includes $25.8 million for development of SEAFIRE.

SEAFIRE is an electro-optic sensor system for shipboard fire control. It includes an installed laser for illumination of surface and shore targets for laser-guided ordnance.

The laser-guided projectile will be useful against a wide range of surface and shore targets, including land targets not in the ship's line-of-sight. Accordingly, the guided projectile should be procured for use in ships armed with 5-inch guns.

SEAFIRE's utility, on the other hand, is limited to direct fire targets within the ship's line of sight. Given the increasing range and lethality of anti-ship missiles, such short-range, direct gunfire scenarios are increasingly unlikely. When required, illumination can be provided by other means. In light of SEAFIRE's high cost and limited usefulness, the committee recommends its cancellation. Commitments made by the Navy to install SEAFIRE on the DDG-51 are nullified, and the committee will seek to confirm this in conference with the House.

The committee recommends authorization of $22.917 million for the SAL-GP/EO Sensor Development program. The reduction of $25.8 million deletes funding for development of SEAFIRE.

F/A-18 SQUADRONS

The administration requested $58.3 million for the evaluation of improvements or modifications to correct fleet reported deficiencies in the F/A-18 Hornet. Included in this request are funds to begin the full scale development of an austere, all weather capability for the F/A-18. The committee strongly supports this effort. The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for F/A-18 squadrons.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY

The committee recommends the addition of $5.9 million for a new Navy research and development program to be called Naval Oceanography.

The committee recognizes the recent, dramatic improvements in the Soviet submarine threat and the need for continued progress in the performance of our ASW sensors. The committee has, therefore, recommended a five-year RDT&E program for research and development of underwater acoustic sensor equipment, acquisition of the most advanced computational resources, and the provision of adequate, secure processing facilities. The goal of this effort is to analyze and model the three dimensional acoustic field on a local and regional basis, supported by the knowledge and understanding of oceanic processes within the volume. The advances in ocean forecast models (thermal and dynamic), as well as the recent experiments in acoustic tomography, provide a basis for this development. It will constitute a major advance over the current two dimensional models.

A task force commander would use such a model to optimize the distribution of ASW ships, submarines and aircraft for the subsurface environment. It would also provide him optimal submarine detection coverage in both area and depth for defense of high value assets as well as for offensive ASW operations.

The committee recommends authorization of $5.9 million as an initial investment in the Naval Oceanography program, and declares its intention to provide $3 million in later years.

OCEANOGRAPHY SUPPORT

Reductions in program elements 65861 (RDT&E laboratory and facility management support) and 65862 (RDT&E instrumentation and material support) shall not be applied against naval oceanographic research activities.

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

The administration requested $72.426 million for the Navy's Manufacturing Technology program.

This program funds the development of advanced manufacturing technologies to improve quality and reduce time required for manufacturing, to reduce acquisition and support costs for military equipment and to reduce dependence on import of critical materials. Major areas of emphasis include improved welding, composites manufacturing, robotic applications, and high speed electronic packaging.

A Navy witness testified this year that the most efficient way to encourage private industry to incorporate advanced manufacturing technology into their operations is to increase competition and thereby reward companies who reduce costs and enhance productivity.

The committee encourages the Navy to continue its new support for improved ship manufacturing technologies and expand its emphasis on advanced composites manufacturing.

The committee recommends authorization of $55.0 million, which is a reduction of $17.426 million and also the same level of funding as authorized in fiscal year 1985.

NEW DESIGN SUBMARINE

The administration has requested funding for several Navy RDT&E programs which support development of the New Design Submarine, designated SSN-21.

The SSN-21 is the designated successor to the SSN-688 class. Current production versions of the SSN-688 are significantly improved over the original SSN-688, and many of these improvements can be back-fitted into earlier ships. The Navy has indicated, however, that the SSN-688 design has reached the limit of design margins and that a new design nuclear-powered attack submarine is needed to keep pace with Soviet submarine developments. When the SSN-21 joins the fleet in 1995, the SSN-688 will have been in construction for 19 years. This year the Navy requested funds to build the forty-ninth through fifty-second units of that class.

The New Design SSN will be a nuclear-powered attack submarine of 9,000 tons displacement, 350 feet in length, with a single screw; the SSN-688, by contrast, is 360 feet long with a displacement of 6,900 tons. The first SSN-21 is scheduled for authorization in fiscal year 1989 and construction would be completed in 1995.

The committee supports development and construction of the New Design Submarine, including the objective of a fiscal year 1989 authorization (which entails long lead funding in fiscal year 1987 and 1988).

The committee acknowledges that the SUBACS (Submarine Advanced Combat System) program is under review within the Navy. The committee is not recommending any changes to the request for funding development of SUBACS.

The committee is aware of the operational necessity for submarines which are superior to those of the Soviet Union, but would also like to state its concern about the projected cost of the planned New Design SSN. This is a particular concern since the unified commanders indicated requirements for more nuclear-powered attack submarines than the Navy plans to fund.

Last year, the Navy indicated a price ceiling had been established by the service for the SSN-21. The lead ship would not exceed $1.6 billion, while the fifth and follow-on ships would not exceed $1.0 billion, measured in constant fiscal year 1985 dollars. For comparison, the cost of an SSN-688 in fiscal year 1985, when four were funded, was $626.5 million.

The committee is concerned that the cost of these submarines may preclude the procurement of enough submarines of this class to meet the overall requirements which are derived from the threat posed by potential adversaries. The committee strongly encourages the Navy to attempt to reduce the unit costs and overall program costs for the SSN-21 program, while maintaining all of the submarine's proposed capabilities.

Further, the committee emphasizes that the SSN-21 must not exceed the cost ceilings which the Navy has established. The committee continues its support for development of the new submarine and expects the Navy to be fully prepared to justify the SSN-21s cost and capability again next year, when authorization of long lead funds for this ship is scheduled.

ADVANCED NAVAL VEHICLES

The main and growing threat to the Navy at sea is from missiles launched from the air, surface, or from under the sea. Future missiles can be expected to have longer ranges, higher speeds, and even more difficult approach profiles.

The present missile threat has already forced the Navy to devote much of its resources toward defense of the battle group, sometimes to the detriment of its offensive capability.

But new technologies and systems concepts could potentially turn more fleet assets to offensive missions. Three among many warrant mention in this report.

Last year the committee authorized $5.0 million for lighter than air technology. The committee understands the Navy has been exploring the potential of a Battlegroup Surveillance Airship to enhance a Surface Action Group's ability to protect itself from antiship missiles. The committee continues to believe that an airship, with its great lifting capacity and long endurance, may have high military value and supports the Navy's studies in this area.

During testimony before the Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee this year, several Navy witnesses also discussed the potential military utility of a SWATH (small waterplane area twin hull) design for certain naval vessels. SWATH ships are much less sensitive than a conventional monohull or catamaran ship to wave actions. Because of its superior seakeeping in heavy seas, SWATH offers better crew effectiveness, higher operational availability, and the ability to maintain both high and very low speeds in rough water. The combination of excellent seakeeping and inherently large deck area also makes SWATH well suited for helicopter and V/STOL aircraft operations. The committee encourages the Navy to give serious consideration to applying SWATH technology where appropriate in the design of new ships.

Finally, the committee is pleased with the Navy's selection of an SES (Surface Effect Ship) design for its new MSH-1 Cardinal Class Minesweeper Hunter. The SES hull, together with the MSH-1s glass-reinforced plastic construction, represent a commitment to innovation which is commendable.

Advanced Vehicle technologies are diverse and to explore their potential contributions fully will require a structured, systematic approach. The committee encourages the Navy to give more explicit recognition to the major contribution which Advanced Naval Vehicles might make to the fleet's future effectiveness. Such recognition would be reflected in the identification of specific programs in the Navy's Research and Development budget to support development of the most promising of the advanced vehicles. The committee expects to give Advanced Naval Vehicles increased attention in the future and encourages the Navy to do the same.

NAVAL GUNFIRE SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

In fiscal year 1984, Congress provided $500,000 for a comprehensive study of the options available to improve the Navy's gunfire capability. The Navy provided an interim report on the status of this program.

The committee is concerned that the Navy may not have fully addressed several key issues which were identified by the committee. These are: the mission capabilities of a Gun Fire Support Ship, including options and preliminary cost analysis; replacement alternatives for the current inventory of 16-inch guns; and a new 155mm or 8-inch gun of longer range than the current 5-inch guns.

The committee requests that the Navy address these issues adequately and forward the amended results to the committee no later than April 1, 1986.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION
AIR FORCE

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		TECHNOLOGY BASE			
1	61101F	IN-HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	17.444		17.444
2	61102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206.334	-2.500	203.834
3	61103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6.250		6.250
4	62101F	GEOPHYSICS	38.614		38.614
5	62102F	MATERIALS	54.769		54.769
6	62201F	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	67.545		67.545
7	62202F	AEROSPACE BIOTECHNOLOGY	50.840		50.840
8	62203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	62.609		62.609
9	62204F	AEROSPACE AVIONICS/VHSI CIRCUITS	74.806		74.806
10	62205F	TRAINING/SIMULATION TECH	25.236		25.236
11	62206F	CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QA	7.125	-7.125	0.000
12	62302F	ROCKET PROPULSION	41.661		41.661
13	62601F	ADVANCED WEAPONS	37.020		37.020
14	62602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	44.819		44.819
15	62702F	COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATION	80.720	-5.000	75.720
16	62703F	PERSONNEL UTILIZATION TECH	9.421		9.421
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	825.213	-14.625	810.588
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
17	63106F	LOGISTICS RESEARCH AND DEVEL REQUIREMENTS	12.736		12.736
18	63107F	AUTOMATION OF TECHNICAL INFORMATION	5.382		5.382
19	63202F	A/C PROPULSION SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	27.493		27.493
20	63203F	ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AIRCRAFT	22.651		22.651
21	63205F	FLT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	22.884		22.884
22	63208F	RECON SENSORS/PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY	9.182		9.182
23	63211F	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES/MATERIALS	23.596	-5.000	18.596
24	63215F	AVIATION TURBINE FUEL TECHNOLOGY	4.671		4.671
25	63216F	ADVANCED TURBINE ENGINE GAS GENERATOR	29.656		29.656
26	63217F	WEAPON SYSTEM POWER	1.947		1.947
27	63226F	DOD COMMON PROG LANGUAGE (ADA) ADV DEV	7.460		7.460
28	63227F	ADVANCED SIMULATOR TECHNOLOGY	4.410		4.410
29	63231F	CREW SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	12.754		12.754
30	63244F	A/C NON-NUCLEAR SURVIVABILITY	3.278		3.278
31	63245F	ADVANCED FIGHTER TECH INTEGRATION	22.276		22.276
32	63250F	LINCOLN LABORATORY	26.363		26.363
33	63253F	ADVANCED SYSTEM INTEGRATION DEMONSTRATION	36.327		36.327
34	63259F	CARTOGRAPHIC APPLICATIONS--TAC AND STRATEGI	1.409		1.409
35	63302F	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	8.381	-3.000	5.381
36	63313F	ADVANCED MISSILE SUBSYSTEMS DEMONSTRATION	1.209		1.209
37	63319F	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY CRUISE MISSILE	7.677		7.677
38	63363F	HYPERVELOCITY MISSILE	10.763		10.763
39	63401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	9.700		9.700
40	63406F	ADVANCED MILITARY SPACEFLIGHT TECHNOLOGY	0.916		0.916
41	63410F	SPACE SYSTEM ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTION TECH	4.954		4.954
42	63424F	MISSILE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	11.550		11.550

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 RFQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
43	63452F	VERY HIGH SPEED INTEGRATED CIRCUITS	193.776	-25.000	168.776
45	63454F	NON-DESTRUCTIVE INSPECTION ADV DEV	0.980		0.980
46	63601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS	28.590		28.590
47	63605F	ADVANCED RADIATION TECHNOLOGY	19.749		19.749
48	63704F	MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL SYSTEM TECH	2.199		2.199
49	63707F	WEATHER SYSTEMS	3.963		3.963
50	63718F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	29.436		29.436
51	63723F	CIVIL/ENVIRONMENTAL ENG TECHNOLOGY	11.488		11.488
52	63726F	FIBER OPTICS DEVELOPMENT	3.861		3.861
53	63727F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	4.895		4.895
54	63728F	ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	8.643		8.643
55	63743F	ELECTRO-OPTICAL WARFARE	15.818		15.818
56	63745F	CHEMICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	6.165		6.165
57	63750F	COUNTER/COUNTERMEASURES ADV DEV	14.444		14.444
58	63751F	TRAINING SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	2.324		2.324
59	63752F	DOD SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	11.742	-5.000	6.742
60	63789F	COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS ADV DEV	26.273	-5.000	21.273
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	713.971	-43.000	670.971
		STRATEGIC PROGRAMS			
62	63311F	ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS	173.934		173.934
63	63312F	ADVANCED CONCEPTS	[ ]		[ ]
66	63364F	SRAM II	78.958	-15.000	63.958
70	63716F	ATMOSPHERIC SURVEILLANCE TECH	4.978		4.978
71	63735F	WWMCCS ARCHITECTURE	8.036		8.036
72	64221F	SPECIAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS	[ ]		[ ]
73	64226F	B-1B	367.438		367.438
75	64234F	COMMON STRATEGIC ROTARY LAUNCHER	72.629		72.629
76	64312F	ICBM MODERNIZATION	1580.824	-15.000	1565.824
77	64326F	STRATEGIC CONVENTIONAL STANDOFF CAPABILITY	71.787	-25.000	46.787
78	64361F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE	14.179		14.179
79	64406F	SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEM	149.934		149.934
80	64711F	SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUC AFFECTS)	7.927		7.927
81	11113F	B-52 SQUADRONS	16.047		16.047
82	11120F	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	[ ]		[ ]
83	11135F	A/C SURVIVABILITY ENHANCEMENTS	[ ]		[ ]
84	11142F	KC-135 SQUADRONS	0.968		0.968
85	11213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	31.203	-9.000	22.203
86	11312F	PACCS/WWABNCP SYSTEM EC-135 CLASS V MODS	5.163		5.163
87	11316F	SAC COMMUNICATIONS	10.625		10.625
88	12310F	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEMS	57.445		57.445
89	12311F	NCMC - SPACE DEFENSE SYSTEMS	72.996	-5.000	67.996
90	12313F	BALLISTIC MSL TAC WARNING/ATTACK ASSESSMENT	2.655		2.655
91	12323F	TW/AA INTERFACE NETWORK	1.468		1.468
92	12325F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	3.069		3.069
93	12411F	SURVEILLANCE RADAR STATIONS/SITES	20.215		20.215
94	12412F	DEW RADAR STATIONS	40.914		40.914
95	12417F	CONUS OVER-THE-HORIZON RADAR	67.457		67.457
96	12423F	BALLISTIC MISSILE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM	12.966		12.966
97	12424F	SPACETRACK	9.613		9.613
98	12431F	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM	79.592		79.592
99	12432F	SLBM RADAR WARNING SYSTEMS	8.235		8.235
100	12433F	INTEGRATED OPER NUDETS DETECTION SYSTEM	20.538		20.538
101	12436F	COMMAND/CONTROL PROCESS/DISPLAY SYSTEM	14.807		14.807

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
104	33131F	MEECN	97.199		97.199
105	33152F	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM	8.100		8.100
106	33154F	WWMCCS INFORMATION SYSTEM--JPMO	88.721	-10.000	78.721
107	33601F	MILSTAR SAT COMM SYSTEM (AF TERMINALS)	132.095		132.095
108	33603F	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
109	35155F	THEATER NUC WEAPON STORAGE AND SEC SYSTEM	1.045		1.045
111	35172F	BERNIE	[ ]		[ ]
112	35892F	SPECIAL ANALYSIS ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
	------	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2410.025		2410.025
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	5743.785	-79.000	5664.785
		TACTICAL PROGRAMS			
113	63230F	ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER	242.852	-40.000	202.852
114	63239F	ADV TACTICAL AIR RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM	20.339		20.339
117	63256F	JOINT SERVICE ADV VERTICAL LIFT A/C (JVX)	4.901		4.901
118	63307F	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY AND RECOVERY	6.178		6.178
119	63320F	LOW COST SEEKER	17.613		17.613
120	63437F	HAVE DJINN	[ ]		[ ]
121	63609F	ADVANCED ATTACK WEAPONS	19.113		19.113
122	63714F	DOD PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT--EXTERIOR	1.010		1.010
126	63742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	8.763		8.763
128	63749F	C3 COUNTERMEASURES ADVANCED SYSTEMS	3.463		3.463
129	63770F	JT SURVEIL TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYS (JSTARS)	3.200		3.200
130	63801F	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	[ ]	-10.000	-10.000
131	64201F	A/C AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	29.397		29.397
132	64209F	F-100 DURABILITY	2.899		2.899
133	64212F	AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8.779		8.779
134	64218F	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM	122.854	-79.400	43.454
135	64219F	INTEGRATED DIGITAL AVIONICS	11.763		11.763
136	64220F	EW COUNTER-RESPONSE	37.193		37.193
137	64222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	2.035		2.035
138	64223F	ALTERNATE FIGHTER ENGINE	33.353		33.353
139	64231F	C-17 PROGRAM	453.681	-40.000	413.681
140	64232F	PAVE RUNNER	[ ]		[ ]
141	64236F	INFRARED SEARCH AND TRACK SYSTEM	23.657		23.657
142	64247F	MODULAR AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT	9.962		9.962
143	64249F	NIGHT PRECISION ATTACK	40.849		40.849
144	64268F	A/C ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	138.574		138.574
145	64313F	T-46A	54.287		54.287
146	64314F	ADV MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE	101.382		101.382
148	64321F	JOINT TACTICAL FUSION PROGRAM	26.920		26.920
150	64362F	GROUND-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE	0.685		0.685
151	64601F	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	22.488		22.488
152	64602F	ARMAMENT ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	17.563		17.563
153	64604F	SUBMUNITIONS	43.910	-10.000	33.910
154	64607F	WIDE-AREA ANTI-ARMOR MUNITION	15.811		15.811
156	64617F	AIR BASE SURVIVABILITY AND RECOVERY	21.900		21.900
157	64703F	AEROMEDICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8.049		8.049
158	64706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	16.779		16.779
159	64708F	OTHER OPERATIONAL EQUIPMENT	17.087		17.087
160	64710F	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT	7.820		7.820
161	64715F	DOD PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT--EXTERIOR	15.733		15.733
162	64724F	TAC C3 COUNTER-MEASURES	17.441		17.441
163	64725F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	13.164		13.164

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
164	64733F	SURFACE DEFENSE SUPPRESSION	54.980	-8.000	46.980
165	64737F	AIRBORNE SELF-PROTECTION JAMMER	11.220		11.220
166	64738F	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	65.792		65.792
167	64739F	TACTICAL PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	75.709	-20.000	55.709
168	64740F	COMPUTER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT TECH	14.011		14.011
169	64742F	PRECISION LOCATION STRIKE SYSTEM	63.081		63.081
170	64750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	13.481		13.481
171	64753F	COMBAT HELICOPTER MODERNIZATION	14.100		14.100
172	64754F	JT TACTICAL INFORMATION DIST SYSTEM (JTIDS)	91.675		91.675
173	64756F	SIDE-LOOKING AIRBORNE RADAR (SLAR)	20.667		20.667
174	64770F	JSTARS	260.221	-50.000	210.221
175	64779F	JT INTEROPERABILITY TAC COMMAND/CONTROL	9.141		9.141
176	11133F	SR-71 SQUADRONS	[ ]		[ ]
177	27129F	F-111 SQUADRONS	54.535		54.535
178	27130F	F-15 SQUADRONS	252.142	-20.000	232.142
179	27131F	A-10 SQUADRONS	3.102		3.102
181	27133F	F-16 SQUADRONS	94.859		94.859
182	27136F	F-4G WILD WEASEL SQUADRONS	36.707		36.707
183	27137F	CONSTANT HELP	[ ]		[ ]
184	27162F	TACTICAL AGM MISSILES	3.926		3.926
187	27247F	AIR FORCE TENCAP	0.250		0.250
188	27411F	OVERSEAS AIR WEAPON CONT SYSTEM	3.068		3.068
189	27412F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEM	20.075		20.075
190	27417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	137.302	-20.000	117.302
191	27419F	TAC AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	8.151		8.151
192	27423F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	123.785	-10.000	113.785
193	27431F	TACTICAL AIR INTEL SYS ACTIVITIES	2.191		2.191
194	27435F	TACTICAL RECON IMAGERY EXPLOITATION	7.691		7.691
195	27584F	SEEK AXLE	[ ]		[ ]
196	27585F	SEEK SPINNER	[ ]		[ ]
197	27591F	OMEGA	[ ]		[ ]
198	27595F	BASE COMM--TACTICAL AIR FORCES	0.899		0.899
199	28010F	JT TACTICAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	4.947		4.947
200	28041F	JOINT ADVANCED SYSTEMS	[ ]		[ ]
201	28042F	HAVE FLAG	[ ]	-20.000	-20.000
202	33605F	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS	7.569		7.569
203	35887F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTEL SUPPORT	1.593		1.593
207	41129F	THEME CASTLE	[ ]		[ ]
208	41840F	MAC COMMAND/CONTROL SYSTEM	11.441		11.441
209	44011F	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	13.993		13.993
	------	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	666.386		666.386
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	3792.137	-327.400	3464.737
		INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS			
210	63431F	SPACE COMMUNICATIONS	45.012		45.012
211	64238F	CONSTANT PISCES	[ ]		[ ]
213	27582F	HAVE TRUMP	[ ]		[ ]
214	31305F	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
215	31310F	FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION	[ ]		[ ]
216	31314F	INFRARED PROCESSING AND EXPLOITATION	[ ]		[ ]
217	31315F	MISSILE AND SPACE TECH COLLECTION	[ ]		[ ]
218	31317F	SENIOR YEAR OPERATIONS	[ ]		[ ]
219	31324F	FOREST GREEN	[ ]		[ ]
222	33110F	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATION SYSTEM	6.930		6.930

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
223	33112F	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS	0.978		0.978
224	33126F	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	11.543		11.543
225	33144F	ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS CTR	7.191		7.191
226	33401F	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]		[ ]
227	34111F	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[ ]	-61.700	-61.700
228	35114F	TRAFFIC CONTROL/APPROACH/LANDING SYSTEM	29.517	-5.000	24.517
229	35159F	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
230	35164F	NAVSTAR GPS (USER EQUIPMENT)	28.691		28.691
231	35165F	NAVSTAR GPS (SPACE/GRD SEGMENTS)	48.527		48.527
232	84733F	GENERAL INTELLIGENCE SKILL TRAINING	5.300		5.300
	------	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2199.143		2199.143
		SUBTOTAL, INTEL AND COMMUNICATIONS	2382.832	-66.700	2316.132
		DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT			
233	63240F	CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT	3.028		3.028
236	63402F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM	70.434		70.434
237	63438F	SATELLITE SYSTEM SURVIVABILITY	4.273		4.273
239	64211F	ADVANCED AERIAL TARGETS DEVELOPMENT	13.505		13.505
240	64227F	FLIGHT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	155.315		155.315
241	64237F	VARIABLE IN-FLIGHT TEST A/C (VISTA)	0.391		0.391
242	64411F	SPACE SHUTTLE	132.007		132.007
243	64609F	LOGISTICS TECH FOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS	6.750		6.750
244	64707F	WEATHER SYSTEMS	13.078		13.078
245	64735F	RANGE IMPRCVEMENT	62.166	-15.000	47.166
246	64747F	ELECTROMAG RADIATION TEST FACILITY	3.376		3.376
247	64755F	IMPROVED CAPABILITY FOR RDT+E	46.417		46.417
248	65101F	PROJECT AIR FORCE	17.445	3.555	21.000
249	65304F	ACQUISITION/COMMAND SUPPORT--TELECOM	6.550		6.550
250	65306F	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4.695		4.695
252	65708F	NAV/RADAR/SLED TRACK TEST SUPPORT	28.319	-8.000	20.319
253	65806F	ACQUISITION AND COMMAND SUPPORT	366.620	-15.000	351.620
254	65807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	431.594	-20.000	411.594
255	65808F	ADV SYSTEM ENGINEERING/PLAN	3.895		3.895
256	65863F	RDT&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	59.820		59.820
257	65872F	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	7.009	-2.000	5.009
258	65874F	PRODUCT PERFORMANCE AGMT CENTER (PPAC)	0.975		0.975
260	35110F	SATELLITE CONTROL FACILITY	83.122		83.122
261	35119F	SPACE BOOSTERS	221.393		221.393
262	35130F	CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER	87.415	-10.000	77.415
263	35160F	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM	71.309	-5.000	66.309
264	35171F	SPACE LAUNCH SUPPORT	79.232		79.232
265	71112F	INVENTORY CONTROL POINT OPERATIONS	4.034		4.034
266	72207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	0.489	-0.489	0.000
267	78011F	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	104.540	-30.000	74.540
269	78026F	PRODUCT/RELIABLE/AVAIL/MAINTAIN PROGRAM	17.365		17.365
270	78031F	LOGISTICS C3I SYSTEM	9.933		9.933
271	91212F	SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT	0.196		0.196
272	91215F	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	0.978		0.978
274	01004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	2.894		2.894
		SUBTOTAL, DEF-WIDE MISSION SUPPORT	2120.562	-101.934	2018.628
		RESTORATION OF CIVILIAN PAY REDUCTION	---	24.400	24.400
		CIVILIAN END STRENGTH FREEZE	---	-8.600	-8.600
		TOTAL, AIR FORCE RDT&E	15578.500	-616.859	14961.641

ADVANCED STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEM

The administration requested $173.9 million for the research and development of advanced guidance and reentry systems under the Advanced Strategic Missile System (ASMS) program in fiscal year 1986.

The ASMS program is an ongoing program designed to provide methods to maintain ICBM force effectiveness against conventional anti-ballistic missile threats. Current work in this program includes the development of penetration aids for Minuteman III, Peacekeeper, and the small missile, and maneuvering reentry vehicle (MARV) and terminal fix system (TFS) options to insure the penetration capability and effectiveness of our ICBM force into the 1990s.

In its report on the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization bill, the committee expressed its concern that insufficient priority was being afforded to this program. This concern grew out of hearings in which the committee received intelligence information regarding Soviet anti-ballistic missile (ABM) activities. These hearings indicated that the Soviet Union is developing the capability to rapidly break out of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

This year, the committee has continued to monitor closely Soviet ABM developments. Ongoing Soviet activities in this area, including the continued construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar in violation of the ABM Treaty, and what appears to be Soviet preparation of a territorial ABM defense, continue to be of great concern to the committee. The capabilities of Soviet surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) against some United States ballistic missiles suggest that the Soviets may be "creeping-out" of the ABM Treaty. In light of these disturbing developments, and the need for a prudent hedges for United States offensive forces against them, the committee continues to believe that the ASMS program should be pursued as a matter of high priority.

The committee is encouraged that funding requested for the ASMS program has been increased this year, and that it is receiving a higher priority in the Department of Defense's out-year planning. In view of the Soviet capability to expand rapidly their ballistic missile defenses beyond the limitations of the ABM Treaty, the committee believes that this funding increase is fully justified. Therefore, the committee recommends full funding of the ASMS program in fiscal year 1986. The committee directs that the resources being provided this program produce systems that can be transferred into the United States ICBM force to insure its penetration effectiveness as soon as possible.

ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE (ACM)

The administration requested funds to continue the acquisition program for the Advanced Cruise Missile (ACM). The ACM is a second generation cruise missile employing low observable technology and other improvements that will ensure that our bombers continue to challenge Soviet air defenses with a mix of penetrating and standoff weapons. The new missile will provide improvements in range, accuracy and survivability over the existing air launched cruise missile (ALCM-B).

The committee has carefully reviewed this program and continues to endorse the planned pace of the program, as well as plans to integrate the missile with the ALCM-B in a force of about 3000 air launched cruise missiles deployed on B-52 and B-1B aircraft. The committee recommends full funding for this program.

SRAM II

The administration requested $78.9 million for research and development of the Short-Range Attack Missile II (SRAM II) in fiscal year 1986. Formerly designated the Advanced Air-to-Surface Missile, the SRAM II is being developed to provide our bomber force with a modern, high performance replacement for the aging SRAM missiles now in our inventory. Technological progress since the SRAM was originally designed means that a SRAM II could have greater range-payload within the same volumetric package as the current SRAM, or that the current SRAM's range and payload capability could be obtained in a smaller envelope, permitting more SRAM IIs to be carried. The Air Force is engaged in ongoing tradeoff analyses of various sizes, and propulsion and guidance techniques, and the Department of Energy has begun preliminary design work for a new nuclear warhead.

The committee concurs in the requirement to develop a replacement for the SRAM based on state-of-the-art technology. The missiles in our inventory today are aging, and rocket motor performance problems are likely to develop. In addition, our SRAM inventory is declining (some are being diverted to the ASAT program), and additional assets will be required to meet future bomber force requirements. This replacement for the SRAM is also required to enhance the effectiveness of our bomber force, and maintain employment flexibility against steadily improving Soviet air defenses.

The committee also recognizes that serious constraints on defense resources will persist over the next several years. Accordingly, the committee directs the Air Force to provide by February 1, 1986, a study comparing the cost, performance, and availability of the Air Force's preferred SRAM II configuration with an "austere" version of the SRAM. This "austere" version shall consist of the current SRAM envelope and rocket propulsion, the existing SRAM warhead (or a minor adaptation of any other in-production nuclear warhead), and inertial guidance based on an existing inertial guidance unit. The committee recognizes that an "austere" version of the SRAM II may not be as capable as an all new design missile. However, in view of anticipated budgetary constraints, the committee wishes to have the benefit of this analysis before committing to full scale development of SRAM II.

In view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends an authorization of $63.9 million for the SRAM II program in fiscal year 1986, a reduction of $15.0 million from the administration's request.

MILSTAR

The administration requested $346 million for research and development of the MILSTAR satellite and $132 million for research and development of Air Force user terminals. Procurement funding of $34 million is also requested for procurement of user terminals.

The MILSTAR satellite communications system will be a survivable, jam-resistant and secure communications system for the National Command Authority. These satellites will use extremely high frequency communications, which are less susceptible to the effects of nuclear detonations and jamming, and they will incorporate a variety of survivability features. In addition to supporting the strategic and tactical forces of all services in peacetime, this system would ensure effective, continuous control of strategic forces both during and after a nuclear attack.

The committee recommends full funding for this program.

C-17 AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The administration requested $435.681 million for research and development of a new airlift aircraft, the C-17. The program is in full scale engineering development.

The committee recommends authorization of $413.681 million for the C-17, development program. This reduction of $40 million is made to comply with overall budgetary limitations and is not expected to delay the initial operational date for the C-17.

NATO IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

One of the more significant deficiencies affecting the capabilities of United States and NATO air forces is the lack of an interoperable, jam resistant IFF (Identification Friend or Foe) system. To overcome this problem, the United States and NATO allies have, for several years, attempted to reach agreement on a new IFF system, known as the NATO Identification System.

Since 1982, the conclusion of a NATO Standardization Agreement (STANAG) that would establish a common frequency for the new IFF system has been described as "imminent". However, during the committee's review of the administration's fiscal year 1986 budget request, it was apparent that agreement remains as elusive as ever.

Two frequency bands have been proposed. The first, is the band utilized by the United States standard Mark XII IFF. The second, is a significantly higher band which would require a substantial modification to all United States (and many NATO) aircraft currently configured with the Mark XII system.

The estimated cost differences between the two approaches is considerable. To develop and procure the NATO Identification System in the frequency band used by the Mark XII IFF, would cost the United States approximately $9 billion. Selection of the alternative frequency (which would require a substantial modification in the antenna and wiring of our existing inventory of aircraft) would cost between $16 and $18 billion. The committee believes such an expense would be totally unjustified and would render the program unaffordable.

The committee strongly endorses the approach recommended by the Defense Department to develop the NATO Identification System (Mark XV) IFF to operate in the same frequency band employed by the Mark XII IFF. The committee believes this effort is of such importance to the survivability and effectiveness of tactical fighter aircraft that the program should proceed despite the fact that a unanimous NATO agreement on the operating frequency has yet to be reached.

The committee recommends approval of the administration's request for the tri-service NATO Identification System program.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ACQUISITION RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)

The administration requested $260.2 million for the development of the Joint Surveillance and Target Acquisition Radar System (JSTARS). This program is designed to develop an airborne radar system capable of long range acquisition and targeting of ground units. The committee strongly supports the development of this essential capability.

The committee recommends an authorization of $210.2 million for the development of the JSTARS. This reduction of $50.0 million from the administration's request is based strictly on budgetary considerations and is made without prejudice.

F-16/SPARROW MODIFICATION

The committee is concerned that cost growth and schedule delays in the Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) program have created serious uncertainties over the effectiveness of United States fighters against an increasingly capable adversary. The problem is particularly acute for the F-16, which is currently not capable of handling the Air Force's existing radar missile, the AIM-7 Sparrow. Even if AMRAAM is ultimately successful and the system is procured, affordability considerations may limit the quantities which can be purchased. Accordingly, the Air Force is directed to report to the House and Senate committees on Armed Services on the feasibility and cost of modifying F-16s to carry AIM-7 Sparrow missiles, and to provide recommendations as to which F-16s (existing inventory aircraft or future production aircraft) should be modified if the program is approved. This report shall be submitted by February 1, 1986.

ADVANCED COMMUNICATION SYSTEM (EJS)

The administration requested $123.8 million for research and development of the Air Force Advanced Communication System. Under this program, also referred to as the Enhanced JTIDS System (EJS), the Air Force will develop a jam-resistant, tactical voice communications system capable of operating in the threat environment postulated for the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The committee recommends approval for the administration's request for the Advanced Communications System.

SPACE BOOSTERS

The administration requested $221.4 million for research and development, and $126.9 million for procurement associated with Space Boosters in fiscal year 1986. The research and development request in the amount of $201.6 million and $120.0 million of the procurement request are associated with the acquisition of ten expendable launch vehicles to complement the Space Transportation System (STS) or shuttle in accordance with Presidential space policy. Research and development funds in the amount of $7.2 million are requested to upgrade the deactivated Titan II Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles into a space launch vehicle configuration that will be used to launch a limited number of smaller satellites including the Defense Meteorological Satellite.

The committee continues its strong support of the expendable launch vehicle program, which it views as needed to satisfy two important requirements: the need for a launch system complementary to the STS as a hedge against unforeseen technical and operational problems; and the need for a launch system suited to operations in crisis situations. The committee therefore recommends full funding for this program. The committee recognizes that without full funding of the research and development request, the availability of the first ELV to meet payload launch requirements in 1988 will be jeopardized; and that without funding of the procurement request, critical portions of the existing Titan launch vehicle production line will shut down thus precluding the efficient transition that is inherent in current Air Force plans.

CONSOLIDATED SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER

The administration requested $87.4 million to continue work on the Consolidated Space Operations Center (CSOC), including $44.2 million for the Shuttle Control System, $17.3 million for associated communications, $16.1 million for an operational training system and $9.8 million related to the Satellite Control System. The procurement request of $34.9 million included $17.6 million for the CSOC, $16.7 million for initial spares and $0.6 million for associated vehicles.

The CSOC will provide management, operational and economic efficiencies by combining satellite control and Space Shuttle military operations in a single complex. The CSOC Satellite Operations Complex will provide greater mission capability and flexibility for the satellite control mission. The Shuttle Operations and Planning Complex will provide enhanced security protection for the control of shuttle missions involving sensitive military payloads. The fiscal year 1986 funding will support the first satellite mission control operations early in 1987, and the initial transition of shuttle operations to the CSOC in 1989.

Due to budgetary constraints, the committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million in the research and development associated with the Shuttle Control System.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION
DEFENSE AGENCIES

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		TECHNOLOGY BASE			
1	61101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	92.600	-2.500	90.100
2	61101W	IN-HOUSE LAB INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	1.981		1.981
3	61103E	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6.250		6.250
4	62101E	TECHNICAL STUDIES	1.800		1.800
6	62301E	STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY	254.400	-10.000	244.400
7	62702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	102.000		102.000
8	62707E	PARTICLE BEAM TECHOLOGY	21.500		21.500
9	62708E	INTEGRATED COMMAND/CONTROL TECH	53.000		53.000
10	62712E	MATERIALS PROCESSING TECH	33.000		33.000
11	62714E	NUCLEAR MONITORING	19.400	6.000	25.400
12	62715H	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	384.361		384.361
	------	POLYGRAPH	[ ]	0.590	0.590
		SUBTOTAL, TECHNOLOGY BASE	970.292	-5.910	964.382
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
	------	STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE	3712.962	-300.000	3412.962
13	63220C	SURVEIL/ACQSN/TRACK/KILL ASSESSMENT	(1386.344)		(1386.344)
14	63221C	DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS	(965.441)		(965.441)
15	63222C	KINETIC ENERGY WEAPONS	(859.724)		(859.724)
16	63223C	SYSTEMS CONCEPTS AND BATTLE MANAGEMENT	(243.300)		(243.300)
17	63224C	SURVIVABLTY,LETHALITY & KEY SUPPORT TECH	(258.153)		(258.153)
18	63225D	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECH DEV	8.413	1.587	10.000
19	63226E	EXPERIMENTAL EVAL OF MAJOR INNOV TECH	175.249		175.249
20	63702D	SPECIAL TECHNOLOGY OFFICE/USDR&E	4.177		4.177
21	63703D	COUNTER-INSURGENCY AND SPECIAL TECH	11.421		11.421
22	35108K	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	2.313		2.313
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECH DEVELOPMENT	3914.535	-298.413	3616.122
		STRATEGIC PROGRAMS			
23	63734K	ISLAND SUN	17.000		17.000
25	32016K	NMCS-WIDE SUPPORT	43.498	-5.000	38.498
27	32019K	WWMCCS SYSTEM ENGINEER	21.254		21.254
28	33131K	MEECN	12.398		12.398
		SUBTOTAL, STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	94.150	-5.000	89.150
		TACTICAL PROGRAMS			
29	21135K	CINC C2 INITIATIVES	2.083		2.083
30	28045D	C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACT C3 AGCY)	72.152		72.152
31	28298D	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JTC3A)	1.472		1.472
		SUBTOTAL, TACTICAL PROGRAMS	75.707	0.000	75.707

LINE NO.	PROGRAM ELEMENT		FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS			
32	62716B	MAP/CHART/GEODESY	0.975		0.975
33	63701B	MAP/CHART/GEODESY INV/PROTOTYPE DEV	20.197	-2.000	18.197
34	64701B	MAP/CHART/GEODESY ENGR DEV/TEST	3.092		3.092
35	31011G	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]	-20.116	-20.116
36	31301L	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
37	31398L	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS GDIP	[ ]		[ ]
38	33126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	18.935	-2.000	16.935
39	33127K	SUPPORT OF THE NCS	5.686		5.686
40	33401G	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY	[ ]		[ ]
41	35139B	DMA EXPLOITATION PROGRAM	[ ]		[ ]
42	35159B	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
43	35159G	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
44	35159I	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
45	35167G	COMPUTER SECURITY	[ ]		[ ]
46	35884L	INTEL PLAN AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
47	35885G	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	[ ]		[ ]
	------	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1826.848		1826.848
		SUBTOTAL, INTEL AND COMMUNICATIONS	1875.733	-24.116	1851.617
		DEFENSEWIDE MISSION SUPPORT			
48	65104D	TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USDR/E	23.593		23.593
49	65106D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR PA/E	3.489		3.489
50	65107D	SUPPORT TO POLICY	6.445	1.005	7.450
51	65108D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR NET ASSESSMENT	4.032		4.032
52	65109D	GENERAL SUPPORT FOR MRA/L	3.117		3.117
53	65110D	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY	2.792		2.792
54	65112D	TECHNICAL ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	16.001		16.001
55	65112E	TECHNICAL ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	[ ]		[ ]
56	65113D	TAPISTRY	2.793		2.793
57	65114E	BLACKLITE	4.000		4.000
59	65801S	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFO CENTER	21.656		21.656
60	65802S	INFORMATION ANALYSIS CENTERS	6.550		6.550
62	65898C	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS SDI	9.222		9.222
63	65898E	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS R & D	13.148		13.148
64	78011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	5.000		5.000
65	01015D	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FUNCTIONS	1.645		1.645
		SUBTOTAL, DEF-WIDE MISSION SUPPORT	123.483	1.005	124.488
		SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E	7053.900	-332.434	6721.466
		DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
1	65111D	FOREIGN WEAPONS EVALUATION	17.010		17.010
2	65804D	TEST AND EVALUATION	86.490	-4.000	82.490
		SUBTOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION	103.500	-4.000	99.500
		RESTORATION OF CIVILIAN PAY REDUCTION	---	1.200	1.200
		CIVILIAN END STRENGTH FREEZE	---	-1.000	-1.000
		TOTAL, DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E	7157.400	-336.234	6821.166

STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY

The administration requested $254.4 million for the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's Strategic Technology Program, including $142.0 million for continued research and development of advanced machine intelligence technology and demonstration of its application to specific defense problems, such as control of an autonomous land vehicle, fleet battle management, and a pilot's associate.

The committee believes that this effort, and related efforts in software and very high speed integrated circuit developments, provide the United States with considerable leverage both in the military competition and in the commercial one. Due to budget constraints, however, the committee recommends a reduction of $10 million in the strategic computing program.

SUBMARINE LASER COMMUNICATIONS

The administration requested $28.5 million for continued research and development of submarine laser communications under DARPA's Strategic Technology program in fiscal year 1986. The specific payoffs of this technology for strategic platforms would be providing messages to SSBNs at depth without compromising the submarine's covertness and increased survivability of the command, control and communications system into the post attack period.

On the basis of recent technical breakthroughs, and in order to provide broad area coverage to increase availability and to enhance survivability, a satellite-based laser transmitter has been chosen as the baseline system approach. Under the current plan, DARPA would transition the submarine laser communications program to the Navy in early fiscal year 1988.

The committee believes that this technology has considerable promise as a potential long term complement to, but not a substitute for, SSBN communications improvements that are now underway. The committee recommends full funding for this research.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The administration requested a total of $3,722.0 million for research and development associated with the Strategic Defense Initiative in fiscal year 1986. The significant increase in funding over that requested last year reflects the high priority being attached to this program. The funding request in the five major program elements is as follows:

Strategic Defense Initiative Funding

[Dollars in millions]

Surveillance, Acquisition, Tracking and Kill Assessment	1,386.3
Directed Energy Weapons	965.4
Kinetic Energy Weapons	859.7
Systems Concepts and Battle Management	243.3
Survivability, Lethality and Key Support Technologies	258.1
Management	9.0
Total	3,722.0

The committee continues to support the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as a high priority research program to analyze and design defenses that could enhance United States and allied security, provide a hedge against a Soviet breakout or "creep-out" of the ABM Treaty, and ultimately, if feasible, provide options to alter the foundation of our strategic security. The committee also recognizes that for the foreseeable future the basis of United States and allied deterrent strength will continue to lie in strong offensive forces.

The committee endorses the articulation of the administration's new strategic concept for a defensive transition as outlined by Ambassador Paul Nitze, including its compatability with United States arms control objectives. Strategic defenses must be survivable and cost-effective at the margins. They must penalize attacker confidence more than the incremental addition of offensive weapons can restore that confidence.

The committee is very concerned by ongoing Soviet efforts to expand their ballistic missile defense capability. These efforts include the continued construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar in direct violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty, and what may be the Soviet preparation of a prohibited territorial ABM defense. In addition, Soviet surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) are assessed to have capability against some United States ballistic missiles. Taken together, these activities raise serious concerns about Soviet intentions regarding the ABM Treaty. The unilateral deployment of a territorial ABM defense by the Soviet Union would undermine the credibility of our strategic deterrent, and would thus be highly destabilizing.

In this light, the committee fully supports the need for treaty compliant technology demonstrations as part of the SDI program. The committee is concerned that the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization (SDIO) is placing insufficient emphasis on near term (within 10 years) defensive deployment options. On the basis of testimony received from public witnesses, the committee believes that a higher priority should be assigned to research on near-term deployment options in support of our deterrent capability, and encourages the SDIO to pursue vigorously these options. Importantly, near term deployment options provide a hedge against a Soviet breakout of the ABM Treaty, and responsive options should such a breakout occur. As such, they provide a disincentive to such an action by the Soviet Union.

The committee is also concerned about the proliferation of Soviet short- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles aimed at Western Europe. Armed with conventional, chemical, or nuclear warheads, these systems pose a serious threat to militarily critical targets in NATO, such as airfields, POMCUS sites, and command centers. In the committee's view, this is an area in which defensive systems could make an important contribution to United States and allied security in the near term. Therefore, the committee believes that the SDIO should coordinate with Department of Defense research and development efforts on anti-tactical ballistic missile (ATBM) options. This program should be conducted in close coordination with our allies. Such a development program should be supportive of our efforts to negotiate reductions in theater nuclear forces by reducing the importance of these systems.

The committee recognizes allied concerns about the SDI, and encourages the administration to continue to consult with them closely. The committee welcomes the statement in support of the SDI issued by the NATO Nuclear Planning Group during their meeting in Luxembourg in March, "We support the United States research programme into these technologies, the aim of which is to enhance stability and deterrence at reduced levels of offensive nuclear forces. This research, conducted within the terms of the ABM Treaty, is in NATO's security interest and should continue. In this context, we welcome the United States invitation for Allies to consider participation in the research programme."

The committee endorses the relative priority of the Strategic Defense Initiative as contained in the President's fiscal year 1986 defense budget request. However, in view of budgetary constraints, the committee recommends an authorization of $3,422.0 million for this program in fiscal year 1986, a reduction of $300.0 million from the administration's request.

In the committee's view, the allocation of this reduction should be left to the discretion of the program manager. However, this reduction should not detract from technology demonstrations nor from the priority which the committee believes should be assigned to research and development on nearer term options. Due to the inter-relationship of all aspects of this program, the committee believes that it would be unwise to make significant reductions in any one of the five major program elements.

JOINT DOD/DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

Last year, the Congress began a pilot program to harness the expertise of the National Laboratories in various non-nuclear technologies—expertise that has been developed in the course of nuclear weapons activities—to DOD's efforts to develop advanced conventional munitions capabilities, and innovative new non-nuclear munitions concepts. The committee strongly supports and endorses this concept, and intends to provide $10 million to DOE directly and a matching $10 million to DoD to accelerate these activities in fiscal year 1986.

GENERAL SUPPORT TO POLICY

The administration requested $6.445 million in research and development for General Support to Policy in fiscal year 1986. This program provides funding for studies and research on national security issues under the cognizance of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

The committee supports the use of external studies and research as an important resource input to defense policy formulation. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $7.45 million for research and development associated with General Support to Policy in fiscal year 1986, an increase of $1.005 million over the amount requested.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The administration requested $82,450.2 million for the operation and maintenance of the armed forces and the component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1986.

The committee recommends authorization of $81,330.8 million for operation and maintenance in fiscal year 1986, a reduction of $1,119.4 million from the February request. The committee estimates that the recommended level of authorization will provide for approximately 3.9 percent dollar growth over the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1985.

[Dollars in thousands]

	Fiscal year 1985 budget authority	Fiscal year 1986 request	Change from request	Recommendation
Army	$18,603,698	$20,190,630	−$277,120	$19,913,510
Navy	25,334,741	25,797,700	−335,917	25,461,783
Marine Corps	1,650,894	1,667,400	−12,944	1,654,456
Air Force	19,213,465	20,924,400	−444,744	20,479,656
Defense Agencies	7,182,599	7,568,900	+3,112	7,572,012
Army Reserve	732,700	779,600	+9,142	788,742
Navy Reserve	828,781	954,500	−28,908	925,592
Marine Corps Reserve	58,842	61,600	−2,860	58,740
Air Force Reserve	881,261	907,700	−9,773	897,927
Army National Guard	1,439,293	1,605,200	+4,356	1,609,556
Air National Guard	1,828,848	1,830,100	−8,724	1,821,376
Rifle Practice	928	920	0	920
Claims, Defense	146,500	158,300	−15,000	143,300
Court of Mil Appeals	2,870	3,200	0	3,200
Other O&M	314,000	0	0	0
Total	78,219,420	82,450,150	−1,119,380	81,330,770

SUMMARY

The committee recommendation on funding for operation and maintenance is based on providing the required funding to maintain and/or improve the current military capability of the United States Armed Forces.

During the past few years, readiness trends have improved. The committee seeks further improvement.

Reductions to the fiscal year 1986 request have been made almost exclusively through reductions in categories of funding. The Department of Defense should utilize authorized funds for programs with the highest priority.

The committee has made adjustments to the operation and maintenance accounts in anticipation of more favorable prices than budgeted for purchases of fuel, foreign currency, supplies, and material by the Stock Funds.

These expected lower costs will allow the Stock Funds to effect refunds (pass throughs) to the O&M customers to offset the reductions made. While these revised projections are consistent with recent experience and current trends, there can be no certainty that they will actually materialize. In the event that savings of the magnitude projected are not experienced by the Stock Funds, sufficient cash balances should exist to make the necessary refunds. The committee expects the Department of Defense to accommodate these reductions through whatever combination of refunds, drawdown of stock fund cash balances, or program reductions that will be least disruptive to program accomplishment. The committee expects program reductions by the services will be made only as a last resort.

FINANCING ADJUSTMENTS

Adjustments were made for the potential changes in prices for fuel, foreign currency, and stock fund items. In order to reduce the balance in the Foreign Currency Fluctuation Fund for defense, a total reduction of $468 million was made and spread equally across the three major services.

PERSONNEL

Reductions were made to reflect the O&M effect of disallowed civilian and military manpower changes.

PAY REDUCTION RESTORATION

The budget request assumed a 5 percent pay reduction for DOD civilian personnel. The committee does not establish civil service pay scales. It appears that the reduction will not be approved by the Congress; thus, the budget has been increased to account for this.

BASE OPERATING SUPPORT

The committee has reduced the Base Operation Support accounts by $25 million from the request of each service. It is hoped that this reduction will encourage the services to take actions to make the current support services more efficient and to consolidate small, dispersed services into common facilities and/or sites.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The administration requested approximately $20,190.6 million for operation and maintenance of the Army in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 8.5 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program. Growth in the request focused on continuing support for modernization, depot maintenance, force structure changes, base operation support, and increased flying hours.

The committee recommends $19,913.5 million in O&M, Army, a reduction of $277.1 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.4 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and provide full program funding to all readiness program items.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$18,603.7
Fiscal Year 1986	20,190.6
Committee Change From Request	–277.1
Committee Recommendations	19,913.5

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	–$27.0
Foreign Currency Fluctation, Defense Transfer	–156.0
Foreign Currency Fund Rate	–131.2
Stock Fund	–182.7
Civilian Personnel	–15.1
Pay Reduction Restoration	+262.4
Base Opearting Support	–25.0
Other	–2.5
Total of recommend changes	–277.1

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The administration requested $25,797.7 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for approximately 1.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program. The request reflected increases in ship and aircraft inventories, flying hours, the modernization programs, and transfers from other appropriations.

The committee recommends $25,461.8 million for Navy O&M, a reduction of $335.9 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .5 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The effect of the committee recommendation is to continue full support for ship operations and flying hours. The budget request and committee recommendations include a financial backlog of 1 ship overhaul in fiscal year 1986 and reduced growth in logistics and support programs.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$25,334.7
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	25,797.7
Committee Change From Request	–335.9
Committee Recommendation	25,461.8

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustments	–$119.7
Foreign Currency Fluctation, Defense Transfer	–156.0
Foreign Currency Fund Rate	–21.4
Stock Fund	–340.2
Civilian Personnel	–18.3

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Pay Reduction Restoration	+$345.7
Base Opearting Support	−25.0
Other	−1.0
Total of recommend changes	−335.9

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The administration requested $1,667.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for approximately 1 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $1,654.5 million for O&M, Marine Corps in fiscal year 1986, a reduction of $12.9 million from the administration request.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and provide full program funding to all readiness program items.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$1,650.9
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	1,667.4
Committee Change from Request	−12.9
Committee Recommendation	1,654.5

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$1.8
Foreign Currency Fund Rate	−5.6
Stock Funds	−14.0
Civilian Personnel	−7.0
Pay Reduction Restoration	+15.5
Total of recommended changes	−12.9

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

The administration requested $20,924.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 8.9 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program. Growth in the request focused on continuing support for modernization, depot maintenance, force structure changes, base operation support, and increased flying hours.

The committee recommends $20,479.7 million in O&M, Air Force, a reduction of $444.7 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 6.6 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The overall effect of the committee recommendation is to continue support for training and modernization, and provide full program funding to all readiness program items.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$19,213.5
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	20,924.4
Committee Change from Request	−444.7
Committee Recommendation	20,479.7

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$162.8
Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense Transfer	−156.0
Foreign Currency Fund Rate	−34.6
Stock Funds	−99.4
Personnel	−157.9
Pay Reduction Restoration	+201.9
Base Operating Support	−25.0
Interim contractor Support	−10.0
Other	−.9
Total of recommended changes	−444.7

INTERIM CONTRACTOR SUPPORT

In fiscal year 1986, the Air Force requested large increases in this area.The requests are reduced by $10.0 million.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration requested approximately $7,568.9 million for operation and maintenance of the Defense Agencies in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 5.4 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $7,572.0 million in O&M, Defense Agencies, an increase of $3.1 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 5.4 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$7,182.6
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	7,568.9
Committee Change from Request	+3.1
Committee Recommendation	7,572.0

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Foreign Currency Fund Rate	−$7.2
Stock Funds	−7.0
Personnel	−38.7
Pay Reduction Restoration	+151.5
JCS Special Fund	−50.0

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
CHAMPUS	−25.0
Other	−20.5
Total of Recommended Changes	+3.1

JCS SPECIAL FUND

As in previous years, the fiscal year 1986 budget included $50.0 million in the O&M, Defense Agencies account for a special contingency fund under the control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee continues to believe this is a low priority program, and has deleted the entire amount requested.

CHAMPUS

According to Department of Defense officials, obligations under the CHAMPUS program are lagging behind projections for fiscal year 1985. Based on fiscal year 1985 experience, the committee feels that a $25.0 million reduction can be made to the fiscal year 1986 request for CHAMPUS.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $779.6 million for operation and maintenance of the Army Reserve in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 6.4 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $788.7 million in O&M, Army Reserve an addition of $9.1 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 7.6 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$732.7
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	779.6
Committee Change from Request	+9.1
Committee Recommendation	788.7

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$1.1
Stock Funds	−9.1
Personnel	+6.9
Pay Reduction Restoration	+12.4
Total of Recommended changes	+9.1

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $954.5 million for operation and maintenance of the Navy Reserve in fiscal year 1986.

The request provided for 15.2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $925.6 million in O&M, Navy Reserve a reduction of $28.9 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 11.7 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$828.8
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	954.5
Committee Change from Request	−28.9
Committee Recommendation	925.6

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$7.0
Stock Funds	−20.3
Personnel	−4.3
Pay Reduction Restoration	+2.7
Total of Recommended changes	−28.9

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $61.6 million for operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps Reserve in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 4.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $58.7 million in O&M, Marine Corps Reserve, a reduction of $2.9 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .2 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1985 Budget Authority	$58.8
Fiscal year 1986 Request	61.6
Committee Change from Request	−2.9
Committee Recommendation	58.7

[Dollars in millions]

Program	Committee recommendation
Stock funds	−$2.1
Personnel	−1.0
Pay Reduction Restoration	+.2
Total of Recommended changes	−2.9

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The administration requested approximately $907.7 million for operation and maintenance of the Air Force Reserve in fiscal year

1986. The request provided for 3.0 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $897.9 million in O&M, Air Force Reserve a reduction of $9.8 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 1.9 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$881.3
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	907.7
Committee Change from Request	−9.8
Committee Recommendation	897.9

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$7.4
Stock Funds	−3.5
Personnel	−12.9
Pay Reduction Restoration	+14.0
Total of Recommended changes	−9.8

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The administration requested approximately $1,605.2 million for operation and maintenance of the Army National Guard in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 11.5 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $1,609.6 million in O&M, Army National Guard, an increase of $4.4 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 11.8 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$1,439.3
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	1,605.2
Committee Change from Request	+4.4
Committee Recommendation	1,609.6

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−$3.2
Stock Funds	−14.0
Personnel	−4.3
Pay Reduction Restoration	+25.9
Total of Recommended changes	+4.4

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The administration requested approximately $1,830.1 million for operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for no growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $1,821.4 million in O&M, Air National Guard a reduction of $8.7 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .4 percent decrease from the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal Year 1985 Budget Authority	$1,828.8
Fiscal Year 1986 Request	1,830.1
Committee Change from Request	−8.7
Committee Recommendation	1,821.4

[Dollars in millions]

Program adjustments	Committee recommendation
Fuel Adjustment	−20.0
Stock Funds	−7.7
Personnel	−7.8
Pay Reduction Restoration	+26.8
Total of Recommended changes	−8.7

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

The administration requested approximately $ .9 million for operation and maintenance of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for .9 percent reduction from the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $ .9 million in O&M, National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice with no reduction from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately .9 percent reduction from the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1985 Budget Authority	$0.928
Fiscal year 1986 Request	.920
Committee Change from Request	0
Committee Recommendation	.920

CLAIMS, DEFENSE

The administration requested approximately $158.3 million for the Claims, Defense account in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 8.1 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $143.3 million for the Claims, Defense account a reduction of $15.0 million from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 2.2 percent reduction from the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1985 Budget Authority	$146.5
Fiscal year 1986 Request	158.3
Committee Change from Request	−15.0
Committee Recommendation	143.3

COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS, DEFENSE

The administration requested approximately $3.2 million for the Court of Military Appeals, Defense in fiscal year 1986. The request provided for 10.3 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

The committee recommends $3.2 million for Court of Military Appeals, Defense, no change from the administration request. The committee recommendation will provide for approximately 10.3 percent growth over the fiscal year 1985 program.

	Millions
Fiscal year 1985 Budget Authority	$2.9
Fiscal year 1986 Request	3.2
Committee Change from Request	0
Committee Recommendation	3.2

OTHER PROVISIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY RAISES, FUEL COSTS, AND INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS

The committee bill includes a legislative provision (Sec.302) to authorize additional appropriations as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement and other employee benefits authorized by law for DOD civilian employees, and unbudgeted increases in costs associated with inflation and the price of fuel.

PAN AMERICAN GAMES, 1987

In 1987 Indianapolis will host the Tenth Pan American Games. These games will be, in effect, the hemisphere's preparation for the 1988 Olympic Games. The Pan American Games, as such, have the full support of the State Department and the White House.

The City of Indianapolis, however, anticipates a shortfall in its ability to meet all security (including anti-terrorist), communication, logistical, and other requirements necessary to stage the Games. There is precedent for Defense Department and Federal assistance—most recently the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympics, the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympics, and the 1979 San Juan Pan American Games.

The authorization of the sum of $25 million in fiscal year 1986 will allow for preparations for the Games to proceed. This total will provide for security, communications, transportation, aviation support, logistical support, and the use of DOD and National Guard personnel and equipment.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized:

(1) to provide logistical support and personnel services to the Tenth International Pan American Games;

(2) to lend and provide equipment in support of the Tenth International Pan American Games; and

(3) to provide such other services and facilities in support of the Tenth International Pan American Games as the Secretary may consider advisable.

Out of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986, an amount not to exceed $25.0 million may be used for the purpose of providing this support.

Except for funds used for pay and non-travel related allowances for civilian DOD personnel and for members of the Armed Forces (other than members of the reserve components called or ordered to active duty to provide support for the Tenth International Pan American Games), no funds may be obligated for these functions unless specifically appropriated for these functions. The costs for pay and non-travel related allowances for civilian DOD personnel and for members of the Armed Forces (other than members of the reserve forces called or ordered to active duty to provide support for the Pan American Games) may not be charged to appropriations made pursuant to this authorization.

The committee has provided this authorization because of the serious security concerns associated with international competitions in today's world. The committee, however, feels that in the future these security and related expenses should be considered as part of the operating costs of such games and competitions, and that the Department of Defense should be reimbursed for the costs of providing security assistance.

Private organizations and government bodies must include these costs in their advance planning process. The committee feels the need for the Department of Defense to assist with security at such competitions is proper. However, a policy should be adopted whereby the request for such assistance and funding support must be approved by the administration and included as part of the Department of Defense budget request, with explicit reimbursement to the Department of Defense for costs incurred.

Obviously, such a policy, as stated above, can only be implemented if all interested and concerned parties are given sufficient advance notice of such a policy change. The committee considers this report language as such advance notice.

U.S.-SOVIET MILITARY EXCHANGE VISITS

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Operations and Maintenance, the committee made available $100,000 to support exchange visits between high ranking military and civilian defense officials of the United States and the U.S.S.R. In 1983, a majority of the members of the Senate endorsed the concept of such regular exchange visits as a means of increasing each country's understanding of the other's strategic military motives, intentions, capabilities and safeguards. In June, 1984 President Reagan emphasized the importance of "reducing the threat and use of force in solving international disputes" and suggested "regular high-level contacts between military personnel and our two countries." In September, 1984 the President called for "a fresh approach to reducing international tensions" and endorsed a variety of proposals for "indepth exchanges of views" including "the exchange of observers at military exercises and locations." The committee believes these funds could help initiate a useful military exchange visit program which could help build confidence and reduce tensions.

Section 304 of Title III authorizes this exchange visit program and directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a plan for the establishment and operation of such a pilot exchange visit program days after the beginning of fiscal year 1986.

OUTFITTING OF RESERVE NAVAL CONSTRUCTION FORCE

The committee expects that within the funds provided by this bill, $59,000,000 will be utilized to procure and provide for retail supplies configured on a unit basis to outfit the Reserve Naval Construction Force. These funds were requested in the Navy Stock Fund to outfit units of the Seabee Advance Base Functional Components.

READINESS REPORTING

In accordance with a requirement established in the fiscal year 1978 Defense Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 95-79), the Department of Defense submits a Force Readiness Report to the Congress each year in support of the annual defense budget. This report is designed to provide Congress a description of the current readiness and sustainability of our military forces and an overall assessment of the execution of the annual defense budget.

Since the first report was submitted to Congress in fiscal year 1979, the Defense Department has made a number of improvements to the material presented in the Force Readiness Report. This report is now the most comprehensive report on the readiness and sustainability of our military forces that is presented to the Congress each year.

In order to further improve the information available to Congress on the readiness and sustainability of our military forces, the committee directs the Department of Defense to make two changes to the material presented in the Force Readiness Report beginning with the submission of the fiscal year 1987 report.

The first change is the inclusion of the information from the Unit Status Reporting System, or UNITREP, in the Force Readiness Report. UNITREP is the basic system for reporting readiness at the unit level throughout the Department of Defense. This system is designed, maintained and controlled by the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (OJCS). The military services collect and report unit status statistics to OJCS in accordance with specific service reporting rules, developed within broad OJCS guidelines.

The committee is aware of the limitations of using material from the Unit Status Reporting System to review force readiness. However, the fact remains that the Unit Status Reports are used by every level of command up through the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee believes that the Unit Status Reports for each of the military services, both the overall ratings and the ratings in each of the four resource areas, should be incorporated into the annual Force Readiness Report prepared for the Congress. The discussion of trends in the Unit Status Reports in the Force Readiness Report should also include an explanation of any changes in the UNITREP reporting criteria in the various services over the previous year.

The second change which the committee believes should be made to the Force Readiness Report is the incorporation of a theater readiness perspective into the Report. Currently, the readiness and sustainability information in the Force Readiness Report is aggregated at the level of the military services. However, warfighting is planned and would be conducted by theater commanders. In recognition of this fact, for the past several years this committee has held hearings with Commanders of the Unified and Specified Commands as part of its review of the annual Defense Authorization request.

Accordingly, the committee believes that the annual Force Readiness Report should incorporate a theater readiness perspective showing the current readiness and sustainability capability of United States forces by theater measured against the current readiness and sustainability objectives for those forces.

The committee believes that these two changes to the annual Force Readiness Report, the inclusion of UNITREP material and the incorporation of a theater readiness and sustainability perspective, will make this Report more useful to the Congress in reviewing the annual Defense budget.

FOREIGN CURRENCY

Since 1979, O&M programs have been protected from unfavorable currency fluctuation through existence of a revolving fund called Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense. Similarly, favorable fluctuations do not accrue to the O&M accounts, but must instead be transferred to the fund. The current balance of the fund is $968 million.

While recent trends are less favorable than assumed in the fiscal year 1986 budget, substantial protection to O&M programs exists even if reductions are made in the authorization and appropriation process. If currency rates do not improve as assumed in the proposed adjustment, DOD will be able to make transfers from the revised balance of $500 million (assuming a reduction of $468 million in the fund balance is made). In addition, DOD has the authority to transfer into the fund prior year unobligated O&M balances.

Thus the proposed reductions may be made without risk to O&M programs, even if the assumption of more favorable currency rates turns out to be wrong.

STOCK FUNDS

The committee is recommending full authorization of appropriations request for the Department of Defense working capital funds for fiscal year 1986. Because of the relationship of the working capital funds to the operation and maintenance account, the committee believes that, given the other reductions in the financing area, full authorization is needed.

The stock funds are revolving working capital funds which finance the "Supply Pipeline" of low-cost, demand-supported consumable items. Examples of the items financed by the stock funds are repair parts such as spark plugs and tires, other consumables such as clothing and housekeeping supplies, and minor end items such as furniture and lawnmowers.

Stock Fund assets consist of two elements: an inventory of supplies and cash on hand. Customers are issued supplies using their appropriated funds. Appropriated funds received are added to the stock fund cash, which is then used to purchase replacements supplies from commercial sources.

The stock funds are not considered an appropriated fund. Obligation authority is apportioned by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget. Congressional appropriation is required, however, to obtain additional funds to augment stock fund cash as well as funds to increase the inventory of stock fund war reserve materials.

Adequate funding for the stock funds is important to the maintenance of the military capability of United States forces. The absence of the bits and pieces procured by the stock funds, while relatively low in unit cost, can cause a shortfall which in turn can cause a weapon system to be ineffective, just as can a shortage of an expensive component purchased through the procurement accounts. Wholesale supply availability which has generally improved in recent years and the number of wholesale requisitions backordered which has generally declined in recent years are important indicators of the stock fund's contribution to readiness.

The funding history of the stock funds and the committee recommendations is reflected below:

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal Year—			
	1983	1984	1985	1986
USA	221.1	388.6	366.4	442.0
USN	354.7	632.9	473.0	716.5
USMC	11.8	20.8	34.9	42.7
USAF	161.6	1,288.7	548.6	464.9
DOD	160.5	43.6	130.7	193.5

The administration requested the following amounts by service for use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital funds.

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1985 budget authority	Fiscal year 1986 request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
Army	366.4	442.0	0	442.0
Navy	473.0	716.5	0	716.5
Marine Corps	34.9	42.7	0	42.7
Air force	548.6	464.9	0	464.9
Defense	130.7	193.5	0	193.5

WATERFRONT SECURITY

The committee has a long-standing concern for physical security in waterfront areas at naval bases, facilities and shipyards.

Within the Department of Defense, the Air Force has been assigned formal responsibility for development and production of systems and techniques for improving waterfront security, as part of their responsibility for all external base security.

The committee believes the Navy is the logical organization to be responsible for security of waterfront areas. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assign to the Navy responsibility for enhancing waterfront security. The Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action to transfer this responsibility to the Navy and shall notify the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of his action as soon as possible and in any event not later than October 1, 1985.

TITLE IV—PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

PART A—ACTIVE FORCE

BACKGROUND ON ACTIVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

Since fiscal year 1972, Congress has been required by law (Public Law 91-441) to annually authorize the active duty end strength of each component of the armed forces. This requirement enhances congressional oversight of military manpower requirements.

This year the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel held 6 hearings to receive testimony on the Department of Defense manpower request for fiscal year 1986. Based on those hearings, the Military Manpower Requirements Report, and other information, the committee has conducted a thorough analysis of fiscal year 1986 manpower requirements.

FORCE STRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS

The force structure for fiscal year 1986 continues to be based on the Total Force Policy, which recognizes that all active and reserve units contribute to success in wartime. Active duty units comprise that portion of the total force needed for a contingency not involving mobilization, for immediate deployment in a major war before Selected Reserve units can be deployed, and for forward deployment in peacetime as a deterrent against conflict.

The following table summarizes the major force structure elements that existed at the end of fiscal year 1984; that are planned for the end of fiscal year 1985; and that are requested and planned for fiscal year 1986.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FORCE ELEMENTS

	Fiscal year—		
	1984	1985	1986
Strategic:			
ICBMs	1,031	1,023	1,009
Bombers (PAA) [1]	297	298	315
Tankers (KC-135) (PAA): [1]			
Active	487	487	487
Guard/Reserve	128	128	128
Interceptor Squadrons:			
Active	5	5	4
Guard/Reserve	11	11	11
Ballistic Missile Submarines (SSBNs)	35	37	38
Tactical/Mobility:			
Land Forces:			
Army Divisions:			
Active	16	17	18
Guard	9	9	[2] 10

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FORCE ELEMENTS—Continued

	Fiscal year—		
	1984	1985	1986
Army Separate Brigade/Regiments:			
Active [3]	10	10	10
Guard/Reserve [4]	26	26	24
Marine Corps Divisions:			
Active	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1
Tactical Air Forces: [5]			
Air Force Squadrons:			
Active	109	109	111
Guard/Reserve [6]	58	57	58
Navy Squadrons:			
Active	86	89	92
Reserve	16	15	15
Carriers (active only)	13	13	13
Marine corps Squadrons:			
Active	30	30	30
Reserve	10	10	10
Naval Forces:			
Attack Submarines (active only)	97	99	99
Surface Combatants:			
Active	193	199	200
Reserve	10	12	16
Amphibious Assault Ships:			
Active	59	59	60
Reserve	2	2	2
Patrol Ships (active only)	6	6	6
ASW and FAD Aircraft Squadrons:			
Active	55	58	60
Reserve	17	17	18
Mobility Forces:			
Airlift Squadrons:			
Active [7]	34	34	34
Guard/Reserve [8]	53	53	54
Sealift Ships:			
Nucleus Fleet [9]	96	118	132
Chartered Fleet	24	20	21

---

[1] Primary aircraft authorized (PAA).

[2] 1 divisioin (29th Infantry (Light)) is activated in fiscal year 1986 by combining the assets of 2 existing separate brigades that are no longer shown as separate brigades in this table.

[3] Includes 1 air cavalry combat brigade, 3 armored cavalry regiments and 1 ranger regiment.

[4] Includes 3 Reserve Component brigades that roundout active divisions, 2 Reserve Component brigades that roundup active divisions, 1 infantry brigade for school support upon mobilization and 5 theater defense brigades. The 2 brigades that will round out the 6th Infantry and 10th Mountain Divisions have not yet been designated.

[5] Includes tactical fighter, tactical reconnaissance, special operations, tanker/cargo (KC-10), and tactical electronic warfare/tactical air control/tactical airborne command and control system squadrons.

[6] Includes 2 KC-10 Reserve Associate Squadrons as of fiscal year 1984.

[7] Includes 14 C-130, 12 C-141, 4 C-5, and 3 C-9 squadrons.

[8] Includes 17 strategic airlift Reserve Associate Squadrons, but excludes rescue, weather, and C-9s.

[9] Includes naval fleet auxiliary force, mobility enhancement, nucleus fleet and scientific support vessels operated by the Military Sealift Command.

SEC. 401, ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTHS

For fiscal year 1986, the Department of Defense requested an active duty end strength of 2,178,100. Most of the growth of 25,630 included within this new level would be in the Navy and Air Force.

The committee recommends an active duty end strength of 2,167,370. This level allows an increase of 14,900 over the fiscal year 1985 level but is 10,730 less than the level requested for fiscal year 1986. The committee recommendation for each military Service is shown below:

ACTIVE DUTY—END STRENGTHS

	Fiscal Year—		1986 committee recommendation	Change from request
	1985 level	1986 request		
Army	780,800	780,800	780,800	0
Navy	571,300	586,300	581,300	−5,000
Marine Corps	198,300	199,500	198,800	−700
Air Force	602,070	611,500	606,470	−5,030
Total	2,152,470	2,178,100	2,167,370	−10,730

In an effort to restrain any further growth in auxiliary and support activities (as measured by Defense Planning and Programming Categories), the committee has authorized only those increases in active duty personnel that were requested in strategic, tactical, and mobility forces.

SEC. 402, QUALITY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

In response to the relatively high numbers of individuals with low scores on the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) and without high school diplomas entering the Services in fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980, Congress enacted quality constraints on the military Services' recruiting programs beginning in fiscal year 1981. Permanent law, section 520 of title 10, United States Code, limits the number of accessions in each Service who score in AFQT category IV to 20 percent in fiscal year 1983 and subsequent years. In addition, there is also a requirement that at least 65 percent of Army male non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates in fiscal year 1985.

The committee bill includes a section extending through fiscal year 1986 the requirement that at least 65 percent of Army male non-prior service recruits must be high school graduates.

PART B—RESERVE FORCES

BACKGROUND ON RESERVE FORCES AUTHORIZATION

The Reserve Forces Bill of Rights and Vitalization Act (Public Law 90-168) requires Congress to annually authorize the average minimum personnel strengths of the Selected Reserve (reservists organized in units) of each reserve component of the armed forces. Unlike actual requirements, the average minimum strengths specified for the Selected Reserve simply represent levels which can be expected to be achieved based on projected recruiting and retention.

SEC. 411, SELECTED RESERVE AVERAGE STRENGTHS

For fiscal year 1986, the Department of Defense requested an increase of 43,138 personnel in the average strength levels of the 7 Selected Reserve components (including the Coast Guard Reserve). Almost 15,000 or 35 percent of this requested growth would be in full-time reserve personnel. (Although full-time reservists are separately authorized in section 412, they are also included within the average strengths of the reserve components in which they are serving.) Full-time reserve personnel serve on full-time active duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training reserve personnel.

Excluding full-time reservists, the committee recommends only modest reductions of 25 percent in the increases requested for the average strength levels of the Selected Reserve. However, the committee's decision to deny all the requested growth in full-time reserve personnel (described below) results in average strength reductions of about 30 percent.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

SELECTED RESERVE PERSONNEL (AVERAGE STRENGTHS)

	Fiscal year—		1986 committee recommendation	Change from request
	1985 level	1986 request		
Army National Guard	432,880	444,000	438,434	–5,566
Army Reserve	278,094	291,900	288,830	–3,070
Naval Reserve	123,900	134,400	131,270	–3,130
Marine Corps Reserve	40,150	41,900	41,760	–140
Air National Guard	105,438	108,700	107,950	–750
Air Force Reserve	72,900	75,600	75,390	–210
Coast Guard Reserve	12,500	12,500	12,500	0
Total	1,065,862	1,109,000	1,096,134	–12,866

SEC. 412, FULL-TIME RESERVE END STRENGTHS

The committee recommends that the entire increase of 19,588 requested in full-time reserve end strengths be denied. Two reasons account for the committee's decision: continuing concern that implementation of this fast-growing program is still encountering problems and budgetary constraints that required the committee to make difficult choices. The committee's recommendations are as follows:

FULL-TIME RESERVE PERSONNEL (END STRENGTHS)

	Fiscal year—		1986 committee recommendation	Change from request
	1985 level	1986 request		
Army National Guard	20,583	30,679	20,583	–10,096
Army Reserve	10,700	14,714	10,700	–4,014
Naval Reserve	15,210	19,510	15,210	–4,300
Marine Corps Reserve	1,129	1,475	1,129	–346
Air National Guard	6,469	7,269	6,469	–800
Air Force Reserve	603	635	603	–32
Total	54,694	74,282	54,694	–19,588

The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense retain his authority to increase the authorized end strengths of full-time reserve personnel by up to 2 percent of their total. In addition, because the committee disapproved all growth in full-time reservists, it is also denying the requested increases in the number of senior enlisted personnel and field grade officers who may be on active duty in support of the reserve components.

PART C—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

BACKGROUND ON CIVILIAN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION

Congress is required to authorize the civilian personnel end strengths requested by the Department of Defense. This requirement affords the Congress the opportunity to oversee the entire defense manpower program and the interrelationship of each component in the Total Force structure.

CATEGORIES OF CIVILIANS

The civilian end strength figures authorized by Congress represent direct and indirect hire employees, both permanent and temporary, including full-time, part-time and intermittent employees paid from appropriated funds, who are employed to perform military functions administered by the Department of Defense. Indirect hire employees are hired by the host nation in support of U.S. forces stationed abroad. There are estimated to be approximately 87,000 such employees in fiscal year 1986. The following categories of civilian employees are excluded from the strengths recommended:

(1) Employees performing civilian functions administered by the Department of Defense, the largest of which is the Corps of Engineers Civil Works activities. For fiscal year 1986, the end strength for this function is approximately 33,000.

(2) Employment in special employment programs for students and disadvantaged youths, such as the stay-in-school campaign and the temporary summer aid program. The end strength for this program is approximately 8,500.

(3) Employees of the National Security Agency who are excluded because employment statistics are classified information.

(4) Employees paid from nonappropriated funds are not included. The approximate number of such employees is 200,000 for fiscal year 1986.

END STRENGTH MANAGEMENT

During fiscal year 1985, Congress permitted the Department of Defense to operate, as a test program, without an authorized end strength and prohibited the use of end strength as a management tool throughout the Department. In short, the Department was not constrained in the number of personnel it could employ except as it was limited by appropriations actually made available to the Department for this purpose.

Witnesses for the Department of Defense have urged that it be permitted to continue to operate during fiscal year 1986 without an authorized end strength. While the committee is impressed with the possibility of obtaining some efficiencies when the Department does not operate with an employment ceiling which must be met on the last day of the fiscal year, it is concerned about its responsibility to effectively oversee not only the mission, but also the size of the civilian component of the Total Force. Therefore, the committee recommends that a statutory end strength on civilian personnel be authorized for fiscal year 1986 and that end strength again be considered a proper tool for management of that workforce.

SEC. 421, FISCAL YEAR 1986 CIVILIAN END STRENGTH

In its fiscal year 1986 request, the Department of Defense has assumed a civilian workforce of approximately 1,106,828. Approval of this requested level would result in growth of about 19,000 and more than 78,800 personnel over the estimated fiscal year 1985 and actual fiscal year 1982 levels, respectively.

The committee recommends freezing the fiscal year 1986 civilian end strength at the fiscal year 1985 level, 1,087,776. Because of difficult budgetary constraints, the committee was forced to identify outlay savings in growing areas of the manpower budget like civilian personnel. To assist the Department of Defense in absorbing new work within the current civilian personnel end strength, the committee proposes that the Secretary of Defense retain his authority to administratively increase the authorized end strength by up to 2 percent.

PART D—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

BACKGROUND ON MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

The fiscal year 1973 Defense Department Authorization Act (Public Law 92-436) requires Congress to annually authorize average military training student loads. Training loads represent the average number of military personnel attending formal military training courses on any given day during the year. These loads do not include training conducted in the field or in combat units where personnel train as crews or units. Included are the following types of training:

(1) Recruit training includes all basic initial enlisted training for all Services for both active and reserve components. In all Services, it represents an introduction of the new enlisted man or woman into military life.

(2) Officer acquisition training includes training programs through which officers are developed, such as the Service military academies, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Officer Candidate Schools, and enlisted commissioning programs.

(3) Specialized training provides both officer and enlisted personnel with skills and knowledge necessary to perform specific jobs or to operate or maintain specific pieces of equipment.

(4) The Army's One Station Unit Training (OSUT) program combines recruit training and initial skill training for certain skills into a single continuous course.

(5) Flight training provides the basic undergraduate flying skills for pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers. This category does not include the major formal advanced combat training programs which are beyond the scope of this authorization since they are conducted by and for operational units. However, some flight-related skills, such as those of the Air Force navigator, bombardier, and electronic warfare officer, are included.

(6) Professional training includes military education, graduate education, degree completion education, and professional development courses not leading to a degree. This training is accomplished at both military and civilian institutions and includes senior service schools, staff colleges, advanced degree programs, Department of Defense schools such as the Defense Systems Management School, and enlisted leadership training.

SEC. 431, MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS AUTHORIZATION

The committee recommends approval of the military training student loads requested by the Department of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense shall adjust these training loads for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force components so that they are consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in other parts of this bill.

The committee's recommendations are as follows:

MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS, FISCAL YEAR 1986, BY COMPONENT AND MAJOR TRAINING CATEGORY

	RECRUIT TRAINING	ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING	OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	FLIGHT TRAINING	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION
ACTIVE FORCES						
ARMY	13,540	12,290	5,335	43,810	1,265	3,446
NAVY	15,015	-	6,924	45,015	1,960	2,104
MARINE CORPS	8,082	-	269	11,050	527	838
AIR FORCE	8,047	-	6,401	22,221	2,806	3,914
SUBTOTAL	44,684	12,290	18,929	122,096	6,558	10,302
RESERVE COMPONENETS						
ARMY RESERVE	4,788	2,236	4	9,762	108	87
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	3,741	6,394	44	8,420	232	55
NAVAL RESERVE	1,513	-	0	1,800	0	42
MARINE CORPS RESERVE	2,117	-	190	1,451	0	32
AIR FORCE RESERVE	443	-	14	1,497	85	79
AIR NATIONAL GUARD	677	-	0	1,790	240	44
SUBTOTAL	13,279	8,630	252	24,720	665	339
TOTAL	57,963	20,920	19,181	146,816	7,223	10,641

TITLE V—COMPENSATION AND OTHER BENEFITS; EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AND MISCELLANEOUS PERSONNEL MATTERS

PART A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 501, MILITARY PAY RAISE FOR 1986

The Department of Defense has proposed that the basic pay, basic allowance for subsistence (BAS), and basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) of military personnel be increased by 3 percent on July 1, 1985. No raise would be given during fiscal year 1986.

Because of difficult budgetary constraints, the committee recommends that the 3 percent increase in the basic pay, BAS, and BAQ of all uniformed personnel be delayed until January 1, 1986. This January 1986 raise would then become effective only 1 year after the last military pay raise of 4 percent on January 1, 1985.

MODIFICATIONS TO HOUSING ALLOWANCES

SEC. 502, VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCES IN ALASKA AND HAWAII

Military personnel are provided with Government living quarters or cost allowances to obtain private housing. Persons not provided Government quarters are paid a basic allowance for quarters (BAQ). Those personnel stationed in high housing cost areas of the continental United States also may receive a variable housing allowance (VHA). Those stationed outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii can be reimbursed for private housing cost×HOs in excess of their BAQ with payments known as rent-plus housing allowances. The rent-plus system was designed to reimburse members for actual housing costs up to certain established ceilings. VHA is designed to provide some reimbursement above BAQ to members assigned to locations in the United States (excluding Alaska and Hawaii) where local median housing costs for members in a pay grade exceeds 80 percent of the national median housing costs for that grade.

The committee recommended in its report on the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 that the rent-plus system be terminated for personnel in Alaska and Hawaii and that these personnel be reimbursed under the VHA system, if otherwise entitled. That recommendation was ultimately enacted into law as part of section 602 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985. However, section 8108 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985, provided that members in Alaska and Hawaii be paid through the rent-plus system and prohibited the payment of VHA to such personnel.

In January 1985, the Department of Defense Inspector General issued Audit Report 85-068 on the rent-plus system in Alaska and

Hawaii. Among that report's findings were that ceilings for the program were inappropriately high, that utility allowances were inflated, that the program lacked cost control incentives, and that local landlords were aware of the established ceilings. All these problems contributed to the cost of housing for personnel in Alaska and Hawaii being at least $25 million a year higher than necessary. The Inspector General recommended that the rent plus system be restructured or that VHA be implemented in Alaska and Hawaii.

The committee has been presented no compelling evidence that the variable housing allowance should not be instituted in Alaska and Hawaii. Whether they are living in Alaska and Hawaii or in the continental United States (in areas like San Diego, Boston, and Washington, D.C.), military personnel and their families encounter the same problems of expensive and limited housing.

Therefore, the committee has included a provision which would immediately terminate the use of the rent plus system for personnel arriving in Alaska and Hawaii and replace it with VHA. The committee provision would provide that any members receiving payment under the rent-plus system on the date of enactment, would not have their housing allowances reduced below the level to which they were entitled so long as they remain continuously assigned in either Alaska or Hawaii.

SEC. 503, ELIMINATION OF EXCESS HOUSING COST PAYMENTS

The Department of Defense has requested that certain windfall payments under the VHA system be terminated. Specifically, some members receive BAQ and VHA in total amounts exceeding their total housing costs. The committee agrees with the Department's request and has included a provision to terminate these windfall payments.

SEC. 504, ADVANCE PAYMENT OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS AND VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE

More and more military personnel who are not provided Government quarters are confronted with a requirement to pay large initial sums of money when renting or leasing private housing. In many areas, it is becoming customary to require that renters pay the first and last month's rent, along with a security deposit, at the time housing is obtained. For military personnel who have just completed a permanent change of station move, this requirement can present an almost insurmountable financial hurdle.

There presently is no authority to pay either BAQ or VHA in advance. Such authority does exist for the payment of a station housing allowance under the rent-plus system outside the continental United States.

The committee believes that authority to pay BAQ and VHA in advance could be used to help members meet the high financial demands often imposed upon them when renting or leasing private housing. The committee, therefore, has included a provision permitting the advance payment of BAQ and VHA. This provision is substantially similar to S. 762, introduced on March 26, 1985. The committee expects that this authority will not be used routinely and that its use will be limited to those cases where needed because of housing market costs.

SEC. 505, INCREASE OF FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Under current law, a Family Separation Allowance (Type II) of $30 per month is paid to military members separated from their dependents for more than 30 days because of temporary duty or change of permanent station orders when their dependents are not authorized government transportation to the new duty station. This allowance is designed to reimburse military members for the expenses that result from family separation.

This allowance was enacted in 1963, and the amount of $30 per month has not changed since that time. The Fifth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation reaffirmed the need for this allowance, and recommended that the monthly rate be increased to $60 per month. For the second year in a row, the defense budget includes a request to increase the Family Separation Allowance from $30 to $60 per month.

The committee believes that the Family Separation Allowance (Type II) should be increased. Section 505 increases this allowance from $30 to $60 per month as proposed by the Department of Defense.

SECS. 506–508, REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERMANENT CHANGE-OF-STATION MOVES

To a much greater extent than civilian employees in the federal civil service and the private sector, military personnel must move from one duty station to another during the course of their service. The average serviceman relocates twice during his first term of enlistment and 7 to 8 times over his entire military career. In other words, moving is a way of life in the military.

Military personnel and federal civilian workers differ not only in the frequency with which they have to move but in the reimbursement they receive as well. Despite the dramatic differences in their conditions of service, the federal government compensates its civilian employees at a much higher rate for government-directed moves than it reimburses military members. This disparity exists in several elements of permanent change-of-station (PCS) compensation: house hunting trips, real estate expenses, per diem enroute to the new duty station, household goods allowances, and temporary quarters allowances. The cumulative effect of these disparities is illustrated by the following example: A typical GS-9 with a wife and 2 children moving from Washington, D.C. to San Francisco can receive a total of $20,044.40 to compensate him for his moving expenses. An E-7 with a family the same size would be reimbursed only $1,699.41 for the same move, or less than 10 percent the reimbursement of his federal civilian counterpart.

The PCS compensation of military personnel obviously falls far short of that of federal civil service employees. Even more troubling, however, is the fact that servicemen are not fully reimbursed for their actual moving expenses. A 1984 survey by the Department of Defense revealed that, exclusive of home ownership costs, the average servicemember is repaid only about one-fourth of the out-ofpocket expenses he incurs. Consequently, over half of military personnel have to borrow or withdraw money from their savings in order to finance the moves that the government requires them to make.

To ease this financial burden on military families, the committee recommends 3 improvements in PCS compensation. First, an increase in the graduated table of household goods weight allowances with a new minimum of 5,000 pounds and a new maximum of 18,000 pounds. Second, a temporary lodging expense of up to $110 per day for a maximum of 4 days. Third, a mileage allowance of 3 1/2 cents per mile for dependents under 2 years of age.

All 3 of these new or enhanced benefits are currently authorized by law. Unfortunately, Congress has never appropriated the funds necessary to actually pay them. Therefore, the committee has changed the authority for these PCS reimbursements to better ensure that they are funded and paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Defense and the Services.

SEC. 509, DENTAL CONTINUATION PAY

Section 311 of title 37, United States Code, authorizes the payment of a special pay to dentists who have completed their initial active duty obligation, are serving in a critical specialty, and have agreed to remain on active duty for at least 1 additional year. Section 8019 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985, provided, in effect, that on June 30, 1985, the amount of special pay which could be offered to dentists under this authority would be reduced by one-half. That reduction would remain in effect until legislation either repealing or amending the authority in section 311 of title 37 was enacted.

The Department of Defense has submitted a proposal to restructure the dental continuation pay authority of section 311 of title 37. However, the committee has elected not to act on this proposal or any other proposal related to military health care until it has conducted a number of oversight hearings later in this session. Since the committee has elected to postpone its consideration of a proposal which, if enacted, would appear to meet the requirements of section 8091 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985, the committee believes that it is appropriate to postpone the effective date of that section until later in the session. Therefore, the committee has included a provision delaying the effective date of section 8091 of the 1985 DoD Appropriations Act until September 30, 1985.

PART B—EXTENSION OF EXPIRING BONUS AUTHORITY, BENEFITS, AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES

The committee recommends that 11 expiring authorities for compensation, special pay, reserve bonuses, and flag and general officer and reserve personnel management be extended beyond their expiration at the end of fiscal year 1985, as set forth below.

SEC. 511, REIMBURSEMENT FOR ACCOMMODATIONS IN PLACE OF QUARTERS

In 1980, Congress authorized the Navy to reimburse certain enlisted members for the housing expenses they incur when their shipboard quarters are uninhabitable during overhaul. If government quarters ashore, a berthing barge, or Government-leased quarters are unavailable, crew members must pay for housing on the private residential market. The reimbursement paid to these individuals is not to exceed the quarters allowance of a member of the same grade without dependents plus the variable housing allowance which could be paid at the location where shipboard quarters are unavailable.

Because the Navy's authority to pay this reimbursement will expire at the end of fiscal year 1985, the committee recommends that it be renewed through fiscal year 1986. The total reimbursement authorized under this section for fiscal year 1986 may not exceed $1.421 million.

SEC. 512, EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY FOR CERTAIN AVIATION CAREER OFFICERS

In fiscal year 1985, authority exists for the payment of aviation officer continuation pay to Navy aviators in aviation communities where shortages actually exist. The committee recognizes that the Navy has experienced an increase in pilot resignations in recent months, which is believed to be due primarily to increased hiring in the airline industry. The committee is also aware that the Secretary of the Navy has recently announced his intention to exercise his existing authority to pay this pay in lump sums within some aviation communities having high pilot resignation rates, so as to increase the attractiveness of this bonus.

The committee believes that the authority that existed in fiscal year 1985 for this pay should be continued through fiscal year 1986. The committee expects that this pay will continue to be targeted only to Navy aviators in aviation communities where actual shortages truly exist.

SEC. 513, EXTENSION OF CERTAIN RESERVE FORCES BONUS AUTHORITIES

Authority for 5 types of bonuses for enlistment or reenlistment in the Reserve Components will expire at the end of fiscal year 1985. The committee recommends that authority for each of these bonuses be extended for 2 years through fiscal year 1987.

The committee notes that under the Veterans' Educational Assistance Act of 1984, persons who enlist or reenlist in the Selected Reserve after June 30, 1985, can become entitled to a new program of educational benefits. This program is designed to serve as a recruiting and retention incentive for the Selected Reserve. Because of the significant increase in benefits which this program makes available to those entering the Selected Reserve, there have been some suggestions that other recruiting and retention incentives for the Selected Reserve could be reduced. However, in a hearing held by the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee on this subject, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs) and the chiefs of each of the Reserve Components urged that these authorities be extended. Their concern was whether the new across-the-board educational benefits test program would, in fact, attract the persons with the skills needed by Selected Reserve units. Because the committee shares that concern, it recommends the authorities be extended.

The bonus authorities which will be extended under the committee provision are:

(1) the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus authorized in section 308b of title 37, United States Code;

(2) the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus for non-prior service personnel authorized in section 308c of title 37, United States Code;

(3) the reserve affiliation bonus for prior service personnel who agree to serve any remaining military service obligation in the Selected Reserve and who are not paid the Selected Reserve enlistment bonus as authorized in section 308e of title 37, United States Code;

(4) the Individual Ready Reserve combat or combat support skill enlistment bonus for non-prior service personnel authorized by section 308g of title 37, United States Code; and

(5) the Individual Ready Reserve combat or combat support skill enlistment and reenlistment bonus for prior service personnel authorized by section 308h of title 37, United States Code.

SEC. 514, EXTENSION OF CERTAIN RESERVE OFFICER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES

The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984, provided temporary authority, scheduled to expire at the end of fiscal year 1985, in 3 areas of reserve officer management. These authorities were made temporary in anticipation of the submission to Congress by the Department of Defense of a comprehensive legislative proposal on reserve officer personnel management. For a number of reasons, the proposal has not been transmitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense, although Departmental witnesses have indicated that it will be submitted during this Congress. In the interim, the committee recommends that 3 authorities provided in the 1984 Defense Authorization Act be extended for 2 more years. The authorities involved are:

(1) the authority relating to the determination of grade upon original appointment of persons as medical officers in the Army or Air Force Reserve, as provided in sections 3359 and 8359 of title 10, United States Code, respectively;

(2) the authority relating to the promotion of certain Army and Air Force reserve officers serving on active duty, as provided in sections 3380 and 8380 of title 10, United States Code, respectively; and

(3) the authority to exclude constructive service credit for education or experience from the computation to determine years of service for mandatory transfer to the retired reserve of the Army or Air Force, as provided in sections 3360 and 3853 and section 8853 of title 10, United States Code, respectively.

SEC. 515, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN CERTAIN GRADES

In March 1982, the Department of Defense submitted to Congress a comprehensive legislative proposal to change the management of flag and general officers. However, neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Armed Services has yet had an opportunity to formally consider the proposal. In the meantime, the Defense Department has continued to operate under a statutory ceiling which authorizes it no more than 1,073 flag and general officers. The ceiling became effective on October 1, 1981.

The number of lieutenant generals/vice admirals and generals/admirals in each Service is derived from a statutory formula based on a Service's total number of flag and general officers. The Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, contained authority for the Air Force to have 1 more general, for the Navy to have 3 more vice admirals, and for the Marine Corps to have 2 more lieutenant generals (1 contingent on a Marine Corps lieutenant general being assigned as Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Central Command) than would be authorized under this statutory percentage formula.

While the Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee intends to consider the comprehensive legislative proposal during this session, the committee believes it is appropriate to continue the authority for these additional senior officer positions until the end of fiscal year 1986 or until the comprehensive proposal is enacted, whichever is earlier.

PART C—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 521, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM

The fiscal year 1981 Department of Defense Authorization Act authorized the Defense Department to test a new recruiting incentive which would repay college loans that enlisted recruits might have assumed before entering the armed forces. Since then, Congress has extended the duration of the test through fiscal year 1985. The committee now recommends that the Department's authority to offer this educational assistance benefit be made permanent.

Under the terms of this program, the Secretary of Defense may repay 15 percent or $500 per year, whichever is greater, of Higher Education Act loans for individuals who enlist or reenlist in specified military specialties in the Selected Reserve. In addition, enlisted members of the active forces qualify for loan repayments at the rate of 33 ⅓ percent of the loan amount or $1,500 per year, whichever is greater. Enlistees in the active and Selected Reserve forces receive 1 year of loan repayment eligibility for each year of service they perform.

The loan repayment benefit offers an incentive to individuals with some post-secondary education to not only enlist but to reenlist as well until the entire amount of their college loans are repaid. At a modest cost, the program attracts the well-educated men and women that the military Services need to provide leadership and to operate their increasingly sophisticated equipment. Because the benefit has proven its value, the committee believes that it should be permanently available to the Department of Defense for recruiting and retention purposes.

SEC. 522, CHANGES TO THE VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1984

Title VII of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, authorized a 3-year test of a new educational assistance program for personnel in the active forces and the Selected Reserve. The program is designed primarily to serve as a recruiting incentive. The test will provide an opportunity to determine if the approach taken in the program is an efficient and economical way to attract the numbers of quality personnel needed by the armed forces.

The program for personnel in the Selected Reserve is an entitlement program under which entitlement to the program's benefits are earned by all persons who have received a secondary school diploma (or its equivalent) before completing initial active duty for training and who enlist, reenlist, or extend an enlistment for a period of at least six years in the Selected Reserve. The benefits are earned after initial active duty for training and after 180 days of service in the Selected Reserve is completed.

The program for personnel serving on active duty or a combination of active duty and Selected Reserve duty is slightly different than the Selected Reserve program. Generally, to be entitled to the benefits under the active duty program, a person must become a member of the armed forces or initially enter active duty during the test period, must serve at least 2 years of active duty, must have received a secondary school diploma (or equivalency certificate) before the completion of the active service required for entitlement, must be discharged with an honorable discharge, be retired, continued on active duty, or released for further service in the reserves, and must have not elected to not participate in the program at the time of initial entry on active duty. The basic pay of a person who initially enters active duty during the test period and who does not elect not to participate is reduced $100 per month for the first 12 months of active duty.

The combination active duty/Selected Reserve duty program is similar to the active duty program except that the member must serve at least two years on active duty followed by four years in the Selected Reserve, the person is not given an opportunity not to participate, and the person's basic pay is not reduced.

Additionally, both the active duty and the combination program provide that persons who earned educational assistance benefits under the Vietnam Era GI Bill and who have remained on continuous active duty since earning these benefits will become entitled to a new benefit after December 31, 1989 (the termination date for Vietnam era benefits). To qualify for this new benefit, they must serve at least three more years of active duty during the test period or, in the case of the combination program, two years of active duty during the test program followed by four years of duty in the Selected Reserve.

The Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee held a hearing on March 11, 1985, on the subject of recruiting, retention, and educational assistance benefits. During that hearing, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Installations and Logistics) and the chiefs of personnel for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps testified. Each of these witnesses was asked if he believed the Department of Defense and the Services would seek to fund the basic entitlement cost of this program in the Department of Defense budget if the Department, rather than the Veterans Administration, were required to pay those costs. Each of the witnesses indicated that, if faced with the choice of funding the basic entitlement portion of the program at the expense of existing recruiting and retention incentives (such as targeted enlisted and selective reenlistment bonuses), he would rather fund the existing programs than the test program of educational benefits.

During that same hearing, the witnesses also addressed a number of areas in the test program for which changes were sought. Among those were an extension of the time in which an individual could decide whether to participate in the active duty program, authority to permit an individual who is participating in the active duty program to elect to terminate his participation and receive a refund of the money withheld from his basic pay, and authority to permit those with Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits who reenter the armed forces, but who have had a break in service since the time they earned those earlier benefits, to earn benefits under the test program which could be utilized after December 31, 1989.

While the witnesses sought other changes in the structure of this program, the committee believes that only the three areas discussed above merit change at this time. Therefore, the committee has included provisions which would permit persons to elect to participate in the program, as opposed to electing not to participate, at any time within four months after initially entering active duty. The required reductions in basic pay of those electing to participate would occur starting in the first month following the month in which the election is made and continuing for 12 consecutive months. This period of time should permit personnel coming onto active duty the opportunity to complete basic training and to arrive at a follow-on assignment before having to make this important election.

Secondly, the committee has included a provision which would permit any person who participates in the active duty program and has his basic pay reduced to terminate his participation at any time during the first 2 years of active duty. A person who terminates his participation would be entitle to a refund of the money withheld from his basic pay because of his participation in the program at the earlier of (1) the end of the period of active duty for which the person initially enlisted; or (2) his first discharge or release from active duty. This arrangement should permit those who are discharged from their initial enlistment prior to the completion of that enlistment for the purposes of immediate reenlistment to receive their refund at that time. Additionally, the committee provision provides that, in the case of any person who has their basic pay reduced because of their participation in the active duty program and who dies while on active duty, without a break in service from the time they entered the period of active duty when the reductions were made, and who has not terminated their participation and received a refund or utilized any benefit provided under the program, the final pay account of such person shall include credit for all such money withheld.

Finally, the committee has included a provision which would permit those who earned benefits under the Vietnam Era GI Bill and who serve on active duty for at least 3 years after June 30, 1985, in the active duty program, or in the case of the combination active/Selected Reserve program, 2 years of active duty and 4 years in the Selected Reserve after June 30, 1985, to become entitled to benefits under the new program which could be used after December 31, 1989, even though those persons have a break in service since the time of their service for which they earned Vietnam Era GI Bill benefits.

SEC. 523, RIGHT OF MEMBER TO TRANSFER EDUCATIONAL ENTITLEMENT TO SPOUSE OR DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Section 901 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1981, provided for a test program of educational assistance under which a monthly educational assistance and subsistence allowance payment for up to 4 academic years could be provided. The program offered participants the options of receiving a lump sum payment upon reenlistment or transferring benefits to dependents upon reenlistment.

In implementing the reenlistment incentive phase of this test program, the Navy identified the second reenlistment as the eligibility point and required that reenlistment to be for 6 years. The Navy regulations, however, provided that benefits could be transferred to dependents after only 4 years of service during that reenlistment. A number of personnel (not more than 225) were advised they could transfer these benefits after serving 4 years in this 6 year second enlistment. This is contrary to the provisions of the law under which the program was established that clearly provide such transfer can occur only after reenlisting after the enlistment which earned the eligibility.

While the committee is at a loss to understand how the Navy could have promised participants in the test program a benefit which clearly was not authorized in the law, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate to penalize individual members who elected to participate in the programs after being improperly promised this benefit. Therefore, the committee has included a provision which would permit participants to transfer these educational benefits to their dependents at the time they were promised by the Navy that they could transfer these benefits.

PART D—MISCELLANEOUS PERSONNEL MATTERS AND BENEFITS

SEC. 531, LIMITATION ON SIZE OF HEADQUARTERS STAFFS

For the past two years, the annual Defense Authorization Bill reported by this committee has included a provision to reduce management headquarters staffing in the Department of Defense. The committee has taken this initiative in order to maintain the pressure on the Department of Defense to reduce unnecessary and duplicative overhead functions and in order to increase the number of military and civilian personnel in operating activities instead of administrative activities.

The fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act mandated a 5 percent reduction in Defense Department management headquarters staffing, with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) allocated an equitable proportion of the reduction. The fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization Act required an additional 2 percent reduction in management headquarters staffing and a ceiling on OSD strength of 1,730. The Secretary of Defense could increase this OSD ceiling by 2 percent with prior written notification and justification to the two committees on Armed Services. Secretary Weinberger informed the committees in December 1984, of such an increase. Both the fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 reductions in management headquarters functions specifically exempted the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (OJCS) and certain intelligence activities.

The fiscal year 1984 budget request included a total of 80,241 military and civilian personnel in management headquarters and management headquarters support functions, excluding personnel in the OJCS and certain intelligence functions. The current fiscal year 1985 estimate for management headquarters and management headquarters support functions in the Department of Defense is 75,040. The fiscal year 1986 budget requests an increase of 248 in management headquarters staffing.

This year the committee bill includes a freeze at fiscal year 1985 levels on management headquarters and management headquarters support personnel in each of the military Services, in the Defense Agencies, and in OSD. The committee considered recommending further reductions in management headquarters staffing. However, the committee elected to freeze headquarters staffing at current levels and defer further consideration of this issue until its current efforts concerning the reorganization of the Defense Department are completed later this year.

SEC. 532, AUTHORITY TO EXEMPT CERTAIN PHYSICIANS AT SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME FROM REDUCTIONS IN RETIRED PAY

The United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home is the Nation's home for veterans of the Regular Army or Air Force. It does not rely on tax dollars, but rather is supported by income from the men and women in the active military service. Among the facilities provided for the more than 2,000 veterans at the Home is a 385 bed acute health care facility, which operates under the supervision of a physician Director and physician Deputy Director.

Because of the nature of the Home and its residents, it has been found that retired military physicians are uniquely qualified to serve as Director and Deputy Director of this medical facility. Previously, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management could grant exceptions to retired military officers who were employed by the Federal Government as medical officers from the reductions in military retired pay required by section 5532 of title 5, United

States Code, in order to meet special employment needs. However, that authority expired on January 11, 1984.

The inability of any official to grant exceptions to these mandatory reduction provisions has created difficulty in hiring qualified senior medical officers at the Home. A similar problem within the Veterans Administration was recognized by the Congress during 1984 when it authorized the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration to waive the retired pay reduction provisions if needed to recruit well-qualified doctors.

The committee believes that the Governor of the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home should have similar authority, but only with respect to the 2 senior medical officer positions at the Home, namely: Director and Deputy Director of the Health Care Facility of the Home. Therefore, the committee has included a provision to provide that authority.

SEC. 533, PRECEDENCE OF THE AWARD OF THE PURPLE HEART

The fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98-525) specified that the Purple Heart should be ranked in precedence among military awards immediately below the lowest decoration awarded by a Service for valor. Unfortunately, the unintended effect of the section was to create differences among military personnel in how they wore their Purple Hearts among their other awards and decorations. Therefore, in order to fix a precise order of precedence, the committee recommends that the Secretaries of the Military Departments accord the Purple Heart a position immediately following the Bronze Star.

SEC. 534, ADVANCEMENT OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IRA C. EAKER, USAF (RETIRED), AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL JAMES H. DOOLITTLE, USAF (RETIRED) TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL

Lieutenant General Ira C. Eaker and Lieutenant General James H. Doolittle are 2 of this nation's great air pioneers and Air Force veterans. Both men served on active duty as lieutenant generals and were retired from the Air Force in that grade. The committee believes that the unique contributions made by Lieutenant Generals Eaker and Doolittle to the development of air power and to the defense of this nation should be recognized and that a fitting and proper means to do so is by including their names among those retired from the armed forces as a general.

The committee therefore has included a provision which would provide authority for Lieutenant Generals Eaker and Doolittle to be advanced to the grade of general on the retired list of the Air Force. Under the provision, there would be no increase in compensation or benefits from the United States to any person because of the advancement of Lieutenant Generals Eaker and Doolittle.

The committee notes that its provision is substantially similar to S.J. Res. 14, which was passed by the Senate on February 21, 1985. Although authority such as that contained in the committee provision has not been utilized often, there have been a number of cases in the past 20 years in which similar authority has been enacted into law.

SEC. 535, AUTHORIZATION FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE TO HAVE LIMITED USE OF COMMISSARY STORES

The fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act included a provision directing the Department of Defense to conduct a test program in 1 or more areas of the United States in which Selected Reservists could be allowed, at their convenience, up to 14 commissary visits each year. Selected Reservists would earn 1 commissary visit for every day of active duty training performed during the year. Reservists would then be eligible to use commissaries in the same manner in which they now use base exchanges. Prior to initiation of this test program, reservists were eligible to shop at commissary stores only when they were on active duty for training.

The committee believes that the successful experience of the test program over the past year warrants expansion of this benefit to Selected Reserve members nationwide. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 535) which authorizes members of the Selected Reserve components to use commissary stores a number of days each year equal to the number of days the member performs active duty for training as a member of the Selected Reserve.

IMPORTATION OF WEAPONS FROM GRENADA

The committee is concerned about the issue of whether the laws and regulations pertaining to importation of weapons as war souvenirs were applied properly with respect to individuals returning from operations in Grenada.

The committee has been briefed by the Navy and the Army and is aware that the Department of Defense Inspector General is conducting an inquiry into the matter. The committee urges the Inspector General to conduct a broad inquiry on this matter and requests that, when it is completed, the Inspector General's report be forwarded to the committee, together with any recommended changes in laws, regulations or practices to assure that justice is equally applied to individuals in such circumstances, regardless of their rank.

TITLE VI—PROCUREMENT POLICY REFORM AND OTHER PROCUREMENT MATTERS

On March 7, 1985, the Senate Armed Services Committee formally approved the creation of a Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was formed to carry on the work of the ad-hoc Task Force on Selected Defense Procurement Matters established in March 1984 by former committee chairman John Tower and ranking minority member Sam Nunn.

The Task Force on Selected Defense Procurement Matters had been created to review a variety of proposals to reform various aspects of the defense acquisition process, as well as to provide a forum for the oversight of defense acquisition issues. The Task Force reviewed and incorporated a package of legislative provisions in the Defense Authorization Bill for fiscal year 1985, including legislation to increase small business participation in defense contracting, to improve spare parts acquisition and to require the Defense Department to obtain warranties from contractors on weapon systems.

From September 1984 through February 1985, the Task Force exercised its oversight function by holding seven hearings on acquisition issues. On September 13 and 20, 1984, the commanders of the procuring agencies of the military departments and two former senior Department of Defense officials testified on general acquisition policy issues. On October 18, the Task Force received testimony on the state of quality control at Hughes Aircraft Company's Tucson plant, where the Army's TOW missile system, the Air Force's Maverick air-to-surface missile and the Navy's Phoenix air-to-air missile are manufactured. On December 13, 1984, a hearing was held on the career paths of acquisition managers in the Department of Defense followed by a December 18 hearing on weapon systems cost reduction. In order to better understand the perspective of private industry on the issue of improvement of the defense acquisition process, the Task Force received the testimony of the chairman and chief executive officer of Lockheed Corporation, Roy A. Anderson and the chairman and chief executive officer of the Martin Marietta Corporation, Thomas G. Pownall on January 30, 1985. On February 20, the panel met to hear defense procurement experts offer their perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of the Defense Department's acquisition system.

The committee believes that the need for greater efficiency in defense procurement continues to be an acute problem and that the establishment of a permanent Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy is the proper means to ensure oversight of the aspects of acquisition policy which may affect the Department of Defense.

Since its formal establishment, the Subcommittee has held four hearings. On March 11, the Subcommittee received testimony from both the military departments and the private sector on increasing the professionalism of the federal acquisition work force. This hearing was followed by a hearing on March 12, 1985 on audit policies in the Department of Defense. On March 19, the panel heard testimony from government and outside witnesses on the employment of former DoD acquisition personnel. The most recent hearing, on March 20, addressed the issue of cost estimating procedures used by the Department of Defense to support the contracting officer during contract negotiations.

SEC. 603, COMPETITION IN MAJOR WEAPON SYSTEM AND EQUIPMENT ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

The committee regards competition as the most effective means of forcing efficiencies in the procurement of weapon systems. Procurement of major weapon systems from two or more sources is one means of insuring that some form of competitive pressure is maintained throughout the life of a program. Section 603 requires that the Secretary of Defense prepare an acquisition plan that includes the establishment and maintenance of two or more production sources for major acquisition programs that meet certain criteria.

Newly-created section 2324 of title 10 directs that the Secretary of Defense prepare an acquisition plan before the completion of full scale development of each major defense acquisition program. Although the preparation of the plan is required only before the completion of the full scale development phase of a major program, the committee believes that the development of the acquisition plan should be initiated in the requirements formulation phase of that program.

The section requires that the acquisition plan provide for the use of competitive procedures as outlined in the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984.

The section further directs that the acquisition plan shall require the establishment and maintenance of two or more production sources for the system integration and for each major subsystem purchased by the Department of Defense when it:

(1) would increase competition and would likely result in reduced overall costs;

(2) would not result in unacceptable delays in fulfilling the needs of the Department of Defense; and

(3) is otherwise in the national security interests of the United States.

The section also requires that the acquisition plan for a major defense acquisition program be submitted to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate as soon as it is completed. In no case may the plan be submitted later than the time of the initial budget request for production of the program.

The provision directs that the Secretary of Defense shall include a statement in the acquisition plan in the event he concludes that the establishment and maintenance of two or more production sources for a major acquisition program is not required. The statement shall include cost estimates or other background material supporting his determination not to establish and maintain two or more production sources.

The committee recognizes that in the case of some major acquisition programs, it will be obvious from informal analysis that the establishment and maintenance of two or more production sources under 10 U.S.C. 2324(b)(1), will not be required. The committee believes that the performance of a formal cost analysis would be superfluous in such cases. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will provide a simplified determination procedure for such cases.

This section is not intended to modify the provisions of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984.

The requirements under 10 U.S.C. 2324 apply to those programs for which funds for initial production are planned to be requested by the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1987 and in subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 604, COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

On March 20, 1985, the Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy held a hearing on the cost estimating methods used to support the contracting officer during the contract negotiation process. The witnesses indicated that, with the exception of should cost analysis, virtually all the cost estimating procedures used by the Services and the Department of Defense rely on historical data and industry trends rather than a careful assessment of the efficiency of an individual defense contractor. A should cost analysis, on the other hand, draws on a variety of industrial engineering expertise to determine the cost of a system produced in the most efficient manner.

Representatives of the Services testified on March 20 that, despite the demonstrated savings that result, should cost analyses are used on a limited basis because of inadequate resources. The committee believes that should cost analyses should be conducted at some point during early production for all major weapon systems for which contracts have been awarded to a single source by other than competitive means.

Section 604 adds a new section to title 10 that directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a should cost analysis, unless specifically waived, during the first four years of production for each major defense acquisition program for which contracts were awarded to a single source by other than competitive means.

Newly-created section 2486 of title 10 directs the Secretary of Defense to perform the should cost analysis for each program with respect to the system integration and each major subsystem at one point during the first four years of production.

The section limits the requirement to those contractors who received a contract award under other than competitive procedures during the first four years of production of the program concerned.

The Secretary of Defense is required to establish criteria for the Secretary of each military department to waive the requirement of 10 U.S.C., 2486 (b)(1) on a non-delegable basis. Any waiver criteria developed by the Secretary of Defense shall be submitted to the committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate and that the criteria may not take effect until 60 days after submission to Congress.

The section further directs that the secretaries of the military departments promptly report any waiver of the requirement for a should cost analysis to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate.

The section expresses the intent of the committee that all should cost analyses required in 10 U.S.C. 2486(b)(1) should be conducted by Department of Defense personnel wherever practical, rather than performed under contract.

The committee believes that the actual cost of conducting a should cost analysis as required by section 2486(b)(1) of title 10 should be fully and accurately reported to the Congress regardless of whether the analysis is performed by Department of Defense employees or whether it is performed under contract. The committee further believes that the Secretary of Defense should provide an estimate of the savings achieved in the program through the performance of the should cost analysis, whether from lower negotiated contract prices or for other reasons. Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is required to supply this information annually to the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate.

The should cost analysis requirement in this section applies to programs for which funds for initial production are provided in fiscal year 1986 and in subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 605, MANAGEMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT PERSONNEL

On December 13, 1984, and March 11, 1985, the Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy received testimony on improving the professionalism of the defense acquisition work force. The committee is concerned that the Services have not stressed the importance of education and experience in the acquisition, support and maintenance of weapon systems in their selection of program managers for major acquisition programs or in their selection for flag and general officer assignments in the major buying commands. The committee believes that the qualification requirements for program managers and flag and general officers in the buying commands of the military departments need to be more explicit.

Section 605 adds a new section to title 10 that requires the Secretary of each military department to issue regulations establishing minimum requirements in education, training and prior experience for program managers of major defense acquisition programs and for flag and general officer assignments to the major buying commands of the Services.

Newly created section 1622 of title 10 requires the Secretary of each military department to issue regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, establishing minimum requirements in education, training and background for program managers of major defense acquisition programs within that service.

The section further requires that the regulations include, at a minimum, that program managers of major programs:

1) have attended the program management course at the Defense Systems Management College or other comparable institution; and,

(2) have had eight years of total experience in the acquisition, support, and maintenance of weapon systems, at least four years of

which must have been spent in assignments in the Army Materiel Command, the Naval Material Command, Air Force Systems Command, Air Force Logistics Command, or successor organizations. The committee recognizes that certain assignments in most of the major commands could be considered to be directly related to the acquisition, support, and maintenance of weapon systems and believes that this experience should be counted against the total eight year requirement. However, the primary acquisition responsibility for each of the military departments is centered in the buying commands specifically listed above. Therefore, the committee believes it is appropriate to require four years of assignments in one of these commands as a minimum requirement for program managers of major acquisition programs.

The section provides that appropriate postgraduate education in a technical or management field as well as attendance at the program management course referred to above may also be used to satisfy the eight year requirement. Non-delegable authority is given to each of the Secretaries of the military departments to waive the requirements for program managers prescribed in 10 U.S.C. 1622(b).

Subsection 611 (c)(1) sets the effective date for the requirement in 10 U.S.C. 1622 (b)(1) on July 1, 1987.

Subsection 611 (c)(2) establishes the effective date for the requirement in 10 U.S.C. 1622 (b)(2) on July 1, 1989.

Newly-created section 1623 of title 10 directs the Secretary of each military department to issue regulations, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, establishing minimum requirements in education, training, and prior experience for any military officer assigned to a position in the Army Materiel Command, the Naval Material Command, Air Force Systems Command, Air Force Logistics Command, or successor organizations, who holds the rank of brigadier general or commodore or any higher rank.

The section directs that the regulations shall include as minimum eligibility criteria the requirements established for program managers in 10 U.S.C. 1622 (b).

The Secretary of each of the military departments is given the authority to waive the requirements in 10 U.S.C. 1622 (b) on a non-delegable basis.

The requirements of 10 U.S.C. 1623 are effective on July 1, 1990.

TRAINING FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE PERSONNEL

The Task Force on Selected Defense Procurement Matters, the predecessor to the Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee, held a hearing on the subject of quality control in the acquisition of weapon systems on October 18, 1984. The committee learned that there is apparently no formal introductory training for quality assurance personnel in the Department of Defense. The committee believes that this is an obvious deficiency in the quality control capabilities of the Department of Defense. New section 10 U.S.C. 1624 requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a formal introductory training program of not less than four weeks in duration for all personnel who are responsible for assuring quality in contractor facilities. Attendance at such a program during the first six months of an individual's service in quality assurance shall be mandatory. The requirement in this section will be effective on January 1, 1987.

SEC. 606, IMPROVED REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE FOR FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE; PREVENTION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Under current law (10 U.S.C. 2397), certain Department of Defense employees who leave government service and accept employment with a defense contractor under certain circumstances must annually file a report with the Secretary of Defense for three years following the termination of their Government employment. The report must include information concerning the location and nature of the employee's work with the Federal Government and with the defense contractor. The Secretary of Defense is to compile these reports and, before April 1 of each year, submit these reports to the Congress. Failure to comply with the reporting requirements of this section carries with it a maximum penalty of $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

In the committee's judgment, the Department of Defense does not collect information sufficient to determine whether a conflict of interest existed for former employees, and current law is inadequate to prevent a real or apparent conflict of interest. Last year, 2,240 reports were filed with the Department and submitted to the Congress. On March 19, the Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee held a hearing to receive testimony on permissible employment and activities of former Department of Defense employees. At that hearing, the Subcommittee reviewed with Defense Department and other witnesses the information captured on the reporting form, and the appearance of a potential conflict of interest of former DoD employees now working for defense contractors.

At the hearing, Deputy Secretary of Defense Taft acknowledged that the Department does not have readily available sufficient information to determine whether a former employee now working with a defense contractor had personally and substantially participated in a matter with that defense contractor that would have required the employee to disqualify himself from dealings with that defense contractor. The Deputy Secretary also admitted that the Department has no way of knowing how many individuals are subject to the reporting requirements but failed to file the required report. To the best of the Deputy Secretary's knowledge, no one has been prosecuted for failing to file the required report.

In light of this and other testimony, the committee has adopted a number of amendments to the present reporting requirement. Some of the amendments update or improve the current provisions of law; others expand the content of the reports which former employees are required to file; finally, the present criminal penalty for failing to file the required report is changed to an administrative penalty which may be imposed by the Secretary of Defense.

In the definition of a "contract" for purposes of coverage of this section, the committee has deleted the term "by negotiation". In the committee's judgment, the method by which a contractor receives its contracts from the government bears little if any relation to the potential influence which a government employee may be able to exert in the selection and award of those contracts. The committee has also raised the threshold for individual contracts which are to be aggregated for purposes of determining coverage from the present $10,000 to $25,000. This increase is consistent with the increase last year in the threshold for the use of small purchase procedures by the Department.

With respect to the application of the reporting requirement, the committee has increased the minimum salary received from a defense contractor for purposes of determining the coverage of employees from the current $15,000 to $25,000. In lieu of the present requirement for an annual report for three years following separation from service, the report will first be required not later than 90 days after employment with the defense contractor begins. Unlike the present law, however, the new section requires that during the two years of post-DoD employment an additional report must be submitted within 30 days only if that former employee's job with that defense contractor significantly changes or the person begins new employment with another defense contractor which would require a report to be filed.

The bill requires a more detailed description of the duties and work performed by a future DoD employee for a defense contractor, and an identification of those matters for which the former employee had responsibility while employed by the Department of Defense. The bill also requires the former employee to describe any disqualification action which he took during the last two years of Federal employment as a result of a personal and substantial involvement in a matter concerning the defense contractor with which the employee discussed employment. The "personal and substantial" test has been incorporated into the reporting requirement. This standard is already defined in the regulations implementing 18 U.S.C. 207.

Finally, the committee has changed the current criminal sanctions for failing to file the required reports to an administrative penalty of up to $10,000, as determined by the Secretary of Defense. Under the amendment, the determination of the failure to submit the required report, and the amount of the fine, are required to be made on the record, after an opportunity for hearing as provided for in the Administrative Procedures Act. The final determination of the Secretary is explicitly made subject to judicial review as provided for under the Administrative Procedures Act. It is the committee's understanding that the current criminal sanctions for a failure to file the required report have rarely been used. The adoption of the administrative penalty will strengthen the enforcement of the reporting requirements.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is the only agency which has a requirement that certain former employees report periodically on their post-employment practices. The committee expects that practice to continue. However, based on the testimony which the committee received, and the information which it reviewed, the committee is convinced that the problems of conflict of interest must be addressed government-wide.

SEC. 607, REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT CONTACTS BETWEEN CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT OFFICIALS AND DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Recently there has been increased public attention given to examples of former Defense Department civilian employees and military officers leaving the Department and immediately going to work for major defense contractors for whom those individuals may have had a responsibility to monitor during their government service. The recognizes that while there have been allegations made against employees affiliated with the acquisition system from many agencies of Government, most of the reports have concerned former Department of Defense employees.

There are several post-employment conflict of interest statutes currently in effect. The broadest federal post-employment restriction, as measured by the number of employees covered, is 18 U.S.C. 207, entitled "Disqualification of Former Officers and Employees." A violation of this criminal provision carries with it a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

In addition, 18 U.S.C. 208 makes it a crime for any federal employee to participate personally and substantially in any contract (or other particular matter) where that employee has a "financial interest," including "negotiating or (having) any arrangement concerning prospective employment." According to testimony at the committee's hearing, however, the courts have held that "discussions" or "contacts" regarding future employment do not constitute "negotiating" for purposes of the statute.

Two other statutes apply specifically to Defense Department employees. 18 U.S.C. 281, the "criminal selling law," provides that "nothing herein shall be construed to allow any retired officer to represent any person in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in whose service he holds a retired status." 37 U.S.C. 801(c), the "civil selling law," provides that payment may not be made to any retired military who is "engaged for himself or others in selling, or contracting or negotiating to sell...to any agency of the Department of Defense...". Both of these acts have been generally held to apply only to retired regular officers, not retired reserve officers.

The committee reviewed these statutes, and received extensive testimony at the committee's March 19 hearing on post-employment practices. While some witnesses expressed a view that decisions of government employees might be affected by the lure of future employment with a defense contractor with whom the employee had personal and substantial involvement, no concrete evidence was offered to support these allegations. The committee was concerned, however, that the present prohibitions on "negotiation" under 18 U.S.C. 208, or the limitations on post-employment practices under the various laws, are not sufficient to ensure that the taxpayers' interests are being adequately protected by persons who seek employment with contractors over whom these government officials have a responsibility to monitor while on the federal payroll.

The committee considered several alternatives to address these concerns, including a simple multi-year prohibition on former employees going to work for certain defense contractors. However, the committee was not convinced that the proper solution lay merely in outright restrictions on post-employment opportunities for certain DoD employees. The committee was concerned that such a prohibition might cast too broad a net into the governmental procurement system and capture employees who did not have "personal and substantial contacts" with defense contractors or could penalize employees who took appropriate action to disqualify themselves from dealings with that contractor. In addition, the committee was concerned that the imposition of such a prohibition could have serious adverse consequences on the Department's ability to adequately attract and retain qualified executives to serve in key procurement assignments.

The committee has therefore adopted a new limitation relating to "contacts" concerning employment between certain Department of Defense procurement personnel and defense contractors.

This new section would apply to civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are paid at a rate equal to or greater than that for a GS-11 under the General Schedule or a military employee on active duty in the grade of 0-4 or higher.

The new section requires that if an official who (a) is subject to the provisions of this section; (b) has "participated personally and substantially" in the performance of a procurement function relating to a defense contract; and (c) has "contacts" with that defense contractor regarding future employment opportunities, that Defense Department employee shall--

(1) promptly report the contact to the employee's supervisor and to the agency's designated ethics official; and

(2) disqualify himself from all participation in the performance of contract functions relating to that defense contractor until there has been a termination of the contact regarding future employment.

The new section recognizes that only one initial contact between the employee and the defense contractor does not mandate either disqualification or reporting provided that the employee terminates the contact immediately. However, if any additional contact of the same nature is made by or with the defense contractor, the DoD employee must report that subsequent contact, and all other contacts with the defense contractor which occurred within 90 days prior to the contact, and take whatever action may be necessary to disqualify himself.

Any report required to be submitted under this section shall include at a minimum the date of each contact and a brief description of the substance of the contact.

Under the terms of the new section, if the Secretary of Defense determines that an employee has failed to report a contact with a defense contractor regarding future employment possibilities, or has failed to take the appropriate action to disqualify himself from participating in the performance of procurement functions relating to contracts of the defense contractor, there would be a two-year prohibition on that employee accepting employment with that defense contractor, and the employee could be subject to an administrative penalty of up to $10,000, as the Secretary of Defense may deem appropriate under the circumstances.

If an employee accepts or continues employment with a defense contractor in violation of the prohibitions in this new section, the former employee shall be liable to the United States for an additional penalty of up to $10,000. Neither of these penalties may be assessed until the Secretary has made a determination on the record after an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act. The Secretary's final determination of a penalty is also subject to judicial review as provided in the Administrative Procedures Act.

In order to encourage agency employees to seek the advice and counsel of their ethics officers, the committee has specifically added several provisions. First, the committee has included a provision urging employees "covered" by this section to request the advice of their supervisors and agency ethics officers regarding action which may be necessary or appropriate in responding to contacts. The committee has also included language specifically authorizing the agency's designated ethics official to issue a written approval of an action which an employee has taken relating to contacts referred to in the report which the employee must submit. Finally, the committee has provided that if an employee has received the written approval of the agency's ethics officer regarding an action which the employee has or should take, then, when the Secretary of Defense considers a determination of a violation of one or more of the provisions of this section, the approval by the ethics officer shall be a rebuttable presumption that the conduct of the employee did not violate the requirements under this provision.

The new provisions regarding contacts between certain DoD employees and defense contractors is to take effect immediately with respect to contacts made on or after the date of enactment of the act.

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has procedures in place governing disqualification actions by certain employees (DoD Directive 5500.7 VII (D)). The committee's action is intended to provide a clear set of circumstances when disqualification is required. The current regulatory procedures provide the means to effectuate that disqualification.

SEC. 608, AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS TO CARRY OUT PROCUREMENT ASSISTANCE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

Section 1241 of the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985 authorized the Department of Defense to provide $2,000,000 in grant or cooperative assistance to local governments or private non-profit corporations for the operating support of procurement outreach centers. The procurement outreach centers were established to assist local businesses in securing contracts with the Department of Defense.

The committee believes that this program has demonstrated its effectiveness on a pilot basis to increase competition for defense contracts and subcontracts and authorizes the Department of Defense to provide $3,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1986 and 1987 to continue Department of Defense participation in this program.

SEC. 609, BURDEN OF PROOF IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACT DISPUTE RESOLUTION

A provision has been included which requires that in any proceeding before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, the United States Claims Court, or any Federal court in which the reasonableness of general or administrative costs for which a defense contractor seeks reimbursement from the Department of Defense is at issue, the burden of proof shall be upon the contractor to demonstrate the reasonableness of the costs.

It appears to the committee that the prevailing law with respect to the reasonableness of costs in government contracts is that a cost that is incurred by a contractor is presumed to be reasonable. (Bruce Construction Corporation vs. U.S. 324 F.2nd 516 (Ct. Cl. 1963)). It is the intention of this section to overturn that presumption and to require that in contract dispute actions, regardless of the forum, a contractor shall have both the burden of going forward and the burden of persuasion where the reasonableness of general and administrative costs is at issue. The committee, however, does not intend that the new section shall be read to create a presumption that costs incurred by the contractor are unreasonable. Rather, the provision places all elements of the burden of proof on a contractor where reasonableness of general and administrative costs must be determined.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT INTERN PROGRAM

The Federal Government Procurement Intern Program is one of the major tools used by the Department of Defense to recruit college undergraduates at the entry level into the defense acquisition work force. Several concerns have been raised with this process. The Department of Defense is only using the intern program for 8 percent of its entry level professional hiring. The Schedule B process, under which the interns are hired after graduation, does not allow for hiring entry level personnel on a career conditional basis, but requires reauthorization of the position every two years. Moreover, under Schedule B, employees can not be promoted beyond the level of GS-9. Discussions with acquisition managers indicate that the reliance on the Schedule B process has greatly weakened the ability of the federal government to compete with the private sector for qualified college graduates.

Given the critical role of qualified civilians in the defense acquisition process, the committee views this situation with serious concern. The Secretary of Defense is directed to report to the Armed Services s of the House and Senate by January 1, 1986 the projected recruiting through the Federal Government Procurement Intern program through the end of fiscal year 1990, whether projected requirements for entry level college graduates can be met through the intern program, and whether some relief must be sought from the Office of Personnel Management from requirements to hire interns under the Schedule B process.

COORDINATION OF AUDIT ACTIVITIES

The Subcommittee on Defense Acquisition Policy held a hearing on March 12, 1985, on audit policy in the Department of Defense. At the hearing, representatives of defense contractors contended that there was a substantial duplication of certain audit activities of the Defense Contract Audit Agency, Department of Defense Inspector General, and other entities of the Department of Defense. Though the Secretary of Defense, the Comptroller of the Department of the Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department generally contended that such duplication does not exist, it appears to the that there is, in fact, some duplication of effort. For example, it appears that several entities in the Department of Defense are simultaneously conducting surveys of executive compensation levels. The committee believes that it is important that there not be overlapping audit responsibilities. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense should establish procedures which ensure coordination of all audit efforts, and which assign one entity in the Department lead responsibility with regard to each type of audit conducted. The Secretary should provide to the committee not later than January 1, 1986, a report on actions he has taken to ensure that there is no unnecessary duplication of Defense Department audit efforts.

TITLE VII—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY MATTERS

SEC. 702, REGULATIONS RELATING TO UNALLOWABLE INDIRECT COSTS

This section requires the Secretary of Defense to issue proposed regulations to amend those provisions of the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation dealing with the unallowability of contractor indirect costs. It is intended that the Secretary shall define with greater specificity detailed types of indirect costs which shall not be reimbursable by the government. The provision itemizes fourteen specific types of cost which the regulation is to make unallowable.

The provision further specifies that if, after the regulations are issued, a contractor submits for reimbursement any general or administrative expense which by clear and convincing evidence is unallowable, the expense shall be disallowed and a penalty equal to three times the amount of the unallowed expense shall be assessed. While the Secretary of Defense may make this disallowance and assess the penalty, actions of the Secretary are reviewable pursuant to the terms of the Contract Disputes Act.

The provision further specifies that in the event a contractor has consistently submitted general and administrative expenses for reimbursement where there is clear and convincing evidence that such expenses are not allowable, the Secretary may impose an additional monetary penalty. Such additional penalty may not exceed one-fourth of the general and administrative expenses submitted for reimbursement under the applicable contract.

A secretarial action to impose the additional penalty for consistent submission of expressly unallowable costs is also reviewable under the terms of the Contract Disputes Act.

Finally, the provision specifies that in the event a contractor submits an expense which was not actually incurred, the submission of such an expense shall be deemed to be a false claim under both the criminal and civil False Claims Acts (18 U.S.C. 287; 31 U.S.C. 3729). The penalties for a violation of the False Claims Acts have been changed by section 704 of this title.

SEC. 703, REGULATION TO CONTROL PRICES THAT MAY BE PAID FOR SPARE PARTS

This section lists seven findings by the Congress on causes for the unreasonably high prices paid in some instances by the Department of Defense for spare parts. The section requires the Secretary of Defense to report to the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate within 90 days after the enactment of this Act on the specific actions taken by the Department of Defense to address the management problems identified in the findings.

The section further directs that in the event the Secretary concludes that any of the management problems listed in the findings above have not been successfully remedied, the Secretary must issue proposed regulations to limit the price that may be charged by defense contractors for spare parts and, if necessary, submit proposed legislation to remedy the management problems listed in the findings.

SEC. 704, INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FALSE CLAIMS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

This section increases maximum penalties authorized in the criminal and civil False Claims Acts (18 U.S.C. 287; 31 U.S.C. 3729) to be imposed on Department of Defense contractors guilty of submitting false claims for payment by the Department of Defense.

The authorized penalty under 18 U.S.C. 287 is increased from $10,000 to $100,000.

The authorized penalty under 31 U.S.C. 3729 is $2,000, an amount equal to two times the amount of damages the government sustains because of the act of the contractor, and the costs of the civil action. This section revises the authorized penalty to $2,000, an amount equal to three times the amount of damages the government sustains because of the act of the contractor, and the costs of the civil action.

SEC. 711, INAPPLICABILITY OF DAVIS-BACON ACT TO MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Section 276a of title 40, U.S.C., known as the Davis-Bacon Act, requires that for all construction contracts in excess of $2,000 in which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party, contractors employing mechanics and laborers must pay those mechanics and laborers the prevailing wage rate as determined by the Department of Labor.

This section of the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 makes the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act inapplicable to military construction projects authorized and entered into on or after the effective date of this act. This exemption from the requirements in the Davis-Bacon Act shall only apply in the event the Senate and the House of Representatives agree to a first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 that provides less than $312.3 billion in budget authority for function 050, National Defense.

SEC. 712, PROHIBITION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PAY RATES FOR PREVAILING RATE EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USING SURVEYS OF WAGES PAID OUTSIDE THE LOCAL WAGE AREA

This section amends section 5343(d)(2) of title 5, U.S.C., by prohibiting the Department of Defense from establishing wage schedules and rates for prevailing rate employees of the Department of Defense on the basis of a survey of wage rates paid for comparable positions in other than the local wage area.

The section does provide that the rate of pay payable to a prevailing wage rate employee employed by the Department of Defense on the day before the date of enactment of this act may not be reduced by reason of this amendment.

SEC. 713, INAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN OVERTIME REQUIREMENTS OF THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT AND THE CONTRACT WORK HOURS AND SAFETY STANDARDS ACT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

This section exempts DOD contractors from the requirements under 41 U.S.C. 35, commonly referred to as the Walsh-Healey Act, to pay an employee an overtime rate of pay for work done in the performance of a Department of Defense contract after completing more than 8 hours of work in any one day. The section provides that any Department of Defense contract to which the Walsh-Healey Act applies shall include a provision requiring the contractor to pay an employee an overtime rate of pay for work done in the performance of the contract after completing more than 10 hours of work in any one day.

This section similarly modifies section 102 of the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. 328).

This section shall apply to all contracts entered into or carried out on or after October 1, 1985.

SEC. 721, REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON CONTRACTING OUT AUTHORITY

There are currently several restrictions on the ability of the Secretary of Defense to contract for the performance of activities and services by non-Government personnel. For example, the Secretary of Defense may not now contract out base security and firefighting activities, nor core logistics functions as he defines them. In addition, the Secretary of Defense has requirements, such as the performance of cost/benefit analyses, which must be met before an activity or service can be contracted out.

This section of the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 provides, notwithstanding any other provision of law, that the Secretary of Defense may contract for the performance of services and activities by non-Government personnel if the Secretary determines that it would be cost effective and in the best interest of the national defense.

SEC. 722, EMERGENCY BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENT

This section amends chapter 159 of title 10, U.S.C., by providing the Secretary of Defense the authority to close or realign any military installation without regard to any other provision of the law that would prevent or delay such closing or realignment. This authority is only provided to the Secretary for a 24-month period following the submission of a budget to the Congress for any fiscal year that reflects a budget deficit for such fiscal year.

The Secretary of Defense is required to notify the Congress 60 days before the date he takes any irrevocable action to implement a closure or realignment of a military installation using the authority in this section.

The Secretary of Defense is further authorized to design or construct such facilities as he determines necessary to effect the closure or realignment of any military installation under this section and the Secretary may, for this purpose, use military construction funds available to the Department of Defense.

TITLE VIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

The committee authorizes the disposal of 21 materials in varying quantities. These materials have all been determined to be excess to the needs of the National Defense Stockpile. The quantities of the materials are the totals for which no current authorization for disposal exists. Authorization for disposals provided for in this Act shall be in accordance with Public Law 96-41.

Section 905 of Public Law 98-525 required that 30 percent of the receipts from sales from the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (less the amounts necessary for exploration, operation, and development of the reserves) be deposited into the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund. The committee took this action out of concern for the status of the National Defense Stockpile and the vulnerability of the United States to disruption in our supplies of critical raw materials from unstable regions of the world. In light of the continued vulnerability of the United States in this area, the committee recommends that 30 percent of the receipts from sales from the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves be deposited in the Stockpile Transaction Fund during fiscal year 1986.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901, SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

The Special Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF) was established by the International Security and Development Cooperation Act, 1981, to finance the acquisition of defense articles and defense services in anticipation of their sale pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or as otherwise authorized by law, to eligible foreign countries and international organizations. The funding ceiling for the SDAF was established in Title 10, Section 138, United States Code, and set at $300 million in fiscal year 1982, $600 million in fiscal year 1983 and $900 million in fiscal year 1984.

The law authorizes capitalization—through time—by:

–Foreign Military Sales (FMS) from DOD stocks of defense articles not intended to be replaced;

–Asset use charges and charges for the proportionate recoupment of nonrecurring research; development, and production costs; and

–FMS sales or reimbursements due to grant aid transfer of defense articles and services acquired with SDAF funds.

In the conference report to the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization Bill, the conferees noted that the SDAF was near its authorized ceiling of $900 million and indicated that they expected the Department of Defense to request an increase in the SDAF ceiling. The administration has requested that the ceiling for fiscal year 1986 be set at $1 billion.

The committee attaches substantial importance to the SDAF and recommends that this request be approved.

SEC. 902, LIMITED AUTHORITY TO EXCEED PERMANENT CEILING ON UNITED STATES FORCES ASSIGNED TO NATO

Since fiscal year 1983, Congress has imposed a year-end ceiling on the number of U.S. military personnel permanently stationed ashore in NATO countries. Most recently, the fiscal year 1985 Defense Department Authorization Act (Public Law 98-525) established a permanent ceiling of 326,414.

Because the ceiling is a rigid upper limit, the Defense Department has had difficulty in managing its huge flow of personnel to and from NATO so that the total number stationed there on September 30th of each fiscal year is at or near, but not above, the ceiling. The magnitude of this management task is indicated by the fact that about 272,000 permanent change-of-station moves were made between the United States and NATO countries in fiscal year 1984 by personnel from 4 different Services.

In order to provide the Secretary of Defense with some managerial flexibility, the committee recommends that he be authorized to exceed the NATO troop strength ceiling by no more than 1/2 of 1 percent. Therefore, the current ceiling of 326,414 could be exceeded by up to 1,632 personnel. With this new authority, the Defense Department should be able to more precisely manage up to the ceiling without violating the law by inadvertently exceeding it. The flexibility that the committee is recommending is similar to that already enjoyed by the Secretary of Defense in managing other congressionally authorized manpower strengths (1/2 of 1 percent of active duty end strengths, 2 percent of full-time reserve end strengths, and 2 percent of the civilian end strength).

The committee emphasizes that it is proposing this new authority only to facilitate the rotation of military personnel within the NATO troop strength ceiling. It does not intend the Defense Department to use this flexibility to station more personnel in NATO than are allowed by the ceiling. Rather, the authority is meant only to compensate for unanticipated fluctuations in the flow of personnel to and from NATO countries.

SEC. 903, PROHIBITION ON INCLUDING GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD EXPENSES IN THE COMPUTATION OF CONTRACTOR PROFITS

There have been numerous recent revelations of unallowable general and administrative expenses being charged to DOD contracts. Expenses are grouped in the category of general and administrative overhead when incurred by a business and allocated to the business unit as a whole. By definition, general and administrative expenses are not directly or indirectly linked to a specific contract and are only properly allocated to the entire business base.

The committee has been concerned that current cost principles and methods of determining contractor compensation may not give contractors effective incentives to hold these costs at their lowest possible levels. A review of the weighted-guideline method used to compute appropriate profit levels by contracting officers for their use in contract negotiations showed that there is a positive correlation between increased general and administrative expenses and increased profits. The Comptroller of the Department of Defense estimated that approximately three percent of contractor profits are associated with general and administrative expenditures.

The committee has included in the bill a requirement that the Secretary of Defense report in writing to the Senate and the House of Representatives on his views regarding the desirability and advisability of legislation or regulations that would prohibit, in the case of any contract awarded by the Department of Defense under other than competitive procedures, the inclusion of any actual or imputed general or administrative expenses in the total cost to which a percentage is applied in order to calculate the anticipated profit to be earned by the contractor.

SEC. 904, LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CONDUCTING POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS; REPORT

Last year, the Congress adopted Section 1307 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 98-525) which prohibited the implementation of a revised Department of Defense polygraph directive which would have permitted increased use of the polygraph as a screening tool, but authorized a test program limited to 3,500 persons for fiscal year 1985. Department of Defense officials had testified that if the new program were fully implemented, upwards of 10,000 persons would be examined per year, in addition to those already polygraphed (applicants for employment at NSA, criminal investigations, etc).

Since the enactment of Section 1307, the Department of Defense issued a new directive, No. 5210.48, dated December 24, 1984. The committee was able to work with Department of Defense officials in the development of that directive and the committee is grateful for the cooperation extended by the Department of Defense in responding to concerns expressed by Members. The new regulations provide comprehensive guidance for all polygraph use in the Department. The regulations continue to permit all the uses authorized by the previous directive (DOD Directive 5210.48, dated October 6, 1975) but add new authority for polygraph use in a limited counterintelligence role for certain programs designated pursuant to the regulations. These programs are among the most highly classified and sensitive of the United States Government. The directive also sets out new procedures to safeguard the individuals who are subject to examination. The committee is satisfied that the directive is carefully drawn and represents a conscientious effort to strike a balance between the need to protect vital matters of national security and the rights of individual members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

However, because the regulations were not issued until December and because the Department has been slow in implementing the program, no persons have yet been examined under the authority of the test program. The committee recognizes that it will not be possible to evaluate fully the proposed program until it has been in operation for some time and a number of persons have been examined. Therefore, the committee has decided to extend the test program authorized last year for another year.

This section provides that no funds may be used to implement those provisions in the new directive which permit expanded use of the polygraph to screen individuals assigned to designated special access programs. This "freezes" the use of polygraphs in the Department to those permitted under the old directive. However, the section further provides authority to conduct a limited test program of the new provisions involving no more than 3,500 persons, including any person who may have been examined in fiscal year 1985 under the authority contained in Section 1307 of P.L. 98-525, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1985. Thus the 3,500 is a cumulative figure. The section also calls for a report by the Secretary of Defense on the implementation of this program by December 31, 1986. As with last year's section, CIA and NSA are exempted. The exemption in paragraph (d)(2) for individuals assigned to a space where sensitive cryptologic information is produced, processed or stored, does not constitute authority for the Department of Defense to apply the directive to individuals outside of the Department of Defense without the consent of the individual's employing agency.

Finally, the section directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a continuing research program on the use of polygraph in the Department of Defense. $590,000 is authorized for this purpose for fiscal year 1986 and the Secretary is directed to keep the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees advised of the progress of this research program.

In last year's report, the committee asked the General Accounting Office to study the effectiveness of the current Department of Defense training program for polygraph examiners. The General Accounting Office is undertaking this study and the committee expects their report by December 1985 when the report of the Secretary of Defense on the test program for fiscal year 1985 is also due to be submitted to the committee. These reports will permit the committee to evaluate DOD's polygraph program prior to consideration of the issue for the Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987.

SEC. 905, RESTRICTIONS ON CONTRACTING FOR EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Section 905 addresses problems that have arisen in the procurement of on-base postsecondary education services for military personnel and their dependents. Although community colleges have participated in off-duty education programs for many years, recent procurement actions have excluded these institutions from competing for the provision of academic services within their lawfully authorized scope of authority, relegating them instead to non-degree vocational and technical courses.

The section provides that in procurements for these educational services, an accredited academic institution authorized to award associate degrees may not be discriminated against or precluded from offering courses within its scope of authority solely because it does not have the authority to award the baccalaureate degree. This section would continue the long-standing practice of allowing community colleges, as well as 4-year baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, to offer these programs. Such equality is particularly important, as historically community colleges have charged tuition at least 25 percent below that of 4-year colleges, and nearly 90 percent of all course credits have been earned at the lower division level, the particular arena of expertise of the community colleges.

The section also mandates continued competition in the offering of educational services to military personnel, so that no single institution gains an absolute monopoly throughout a military theater or command. At the same time, the section reinforces the concept that in the administration of these educational programs the military Services will take appropriate measures to avoid unnecessary duplication of course offerings. The committee believes that this duplication can best be avoided by the base Educational Services Officers, rather than by eliminating competition throughout an entire theater or command.

The section recognizes the special circumstances which attend the provision of educational services aboard Navy ships, and excludes such programs from the requirement of encouraging multiple institutional providers. The section also recognizes the need to avoid disruption of existing educational service agreements, and therefore extends only to courses provided after September 1, 1985, thus allowing present programs to continue through the end of the current academic year.

SEC. 906, ANNUAL REPORT ON SOVIET COMPLIANCE WITH ARMS CONTROL COMMITMENTS

In accordance with the requirement contained in the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization bill, the Congress has received the administration's second report on Soviet non-compliance with their arms control commitments. The committee has reviewed the administration's findings in the February 1985 report, which confirmed the findings contained in their January 1984 report and in some cases strengthened them. In addition, the committee has studied the evidentiary basis for these findings in closed session with representatives from the intelligence community.

The committee views with serious concern what appears to be a pattern of expanding Soviet violations of important arms control agreements. Soviet violation of SALT II the 1972 ABM Treaty, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the Helsinki Final Act, the Geneva Protocol on Chemical Weapons, and the Limited Test Ban Treaty raise serious questions about the arms control process. If arms control is to make a positive contribution to our national security, then the terms of these agreements must be strictly adhered to by all parties. We must not let double standards develop in the area of treaty compliance.

The committee has found these reports from the administration helpful in fulfilling its obligations to determine United States national security requirements. In this regard, the committee reestablishes its requirement that the administration provide to the Congress by December 1, 1985 an additional report in both classified and unclassified forms that reflects an update on the compliance issues they have covered to date, as well as any further findings regarding Soviet non-compliance with their treaty obligations. In addition, the committee includes statutory language in Section 906 that makes this an annual reporting requirement.

While the committee views these reports as helpful, it encourages the administration to develop policy and programmatic responses to Soviet treaty violations. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by July 15, 1985, a report that addresses the military implications of Soviet treaty violations. This report should detail possible policy and programmatic responses, including weapon system developments or procurements, that could redress the implications of Soviet treaty violations for United States national security. The conclusions of this report will be utilized in hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee. In addition, the committee will be soliciting the views of public witnesses on this important subject.

SEC. 907, REPORT ON USE OF INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Section 1203 (a) of the 1984 Department of Defense Authorization Act added a new provision to title 10, codified as 10 U.S.C. 139C, prohibiting the Secretary of Defense from approving full scale engineering development or the production and deployment of a major defense program, unless an independent estimate of the cost of the program has been submitted to, and considered by, the Secretary.

This provision was added because the committee believed that the Department's program of independent cost estimates was a valuable management tool and should be expanded to require an independent cost estimate by the Office of the Secretary of Defense prior to approving full scale engineering development.

The Authorization Act for fiscal year 1984 also required, in section 1203(c), that the Secretary report to the Committees on Armed Services in the Senate and House of Representatives on the use of independent cost estimates in the Department, and on whether adequate financial and personnel resources had been allocated to this program. Secretary Weinberger submitted that report on May 1, 1984. The committee reviewed the report carefully and found it extremely useful. It detailed the great utility of independent cost estimates in developing an acquisition strategy and assessing true costs and states that because such estimates play a crucial role, more resources are being assigned to the program.

As a result, the committee adopted a provision in last year's Authorization Act (section 1253) which required a follow-on report. That report is due on May 1, 1985 and the committee expects that it will be useful in continuing to monitor the role of independent cost estimating in the acquisition process. The committee also believes that it will be useful to receive at least one more report on the use of independent cost estimates and so directs that the Secretary of Defense submit another follow-on report by April 1, 1986.

SEC. 908, EXTENSION OF REPORTING DATES FOR THE COMMISSION ON MERCHANT MARINE AND DEFENSE

Last year the Congress authorized $1.5 million for establishment of the Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense. No funds were appropriated.

Bill language stated that the Commission would study problems relating to transportation of cargo and personnel for national defense purposes in time of war or national emergency, the capability of the United States merchant marine to meet the need for such transportation, and the adequacy of the United States shipbuilding and industrial base. The Commission was to make specific recommendations for action to foster and maintain a merchant marine capable of meeting national security requirements.

The committee recommends that funds for the Commission be appropriated as soon as possible or in the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. Furthermore, the committee has recommended bill language this year which extends the dates required for completion of the Commission's actions by one year, since funding has been delayed.

SEC. 909, TWO YEAR BUDGET CYCLE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The committee believes it is important that Congress adopt a two year cycle for authorization and appropriation of funds for the Department of Defense. While ideally this would be part of a comprehensive government-wide conversion to a two year budget process, such a change is unlikely to occur soon. This should not preclude adoption of a two year cycle for national defense, since DOD already has a comprehensive multi-year planning, programming and budgeting system.

The burdens of an annual process have become too cumbersome, both for DOD and the Congress. Virtually all aspects of the defense budget are now subject to annual authorizations. There are nearly 2000 procurement programs and over a thousand research and development programs. Reviewing each in detail every year is proving more and more time consuming and unnecessary. Forcing all programs through an annual review is also unnecessarily disruptive. At the same time the Defense Department is working on three separate budgets--execution on the fiscal year 1985 program, defending the request for fiscal year 1986, and developing a five year program that will be submitted for fiscal year 1987.

More important, however, by using its time to review virtually every line item in the budget, both the Congress and the Department forego opportunities to focus on the more fundamental issues of defense policy: the establishment of national priorities and the broad allocation of defense resources toward those priorities.

There is widespread concensus on the desirability of a two year cycle. The Secretary of Defense has repeatedly endorsed the idea and indicated his willingness to cooperate to achieve it. The Temporary Select Committee to Study the Senate Committee System endorsed the concept of a two year budget. Several members of the Armed Services Committee have sponsored independent legislation to adopt a two year budget cycle.

While there is widespread concensus on its desirability, no one has outlined the specific details that need to be analyzed in order to accomplish this change. The committee recognizes that it will not be possible to move to a two year budget without adequate planning and preparation. Consequently, the committee includes a section in the bill which (1) expresses the sense of the Congress that, beginning in fiscal year 1988, Congress should adopt two year defense budgets; that (2) requires the President to submit a two year budget, beginning in fiscal year 1988; and (3) directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report, by July 1, 1986, on the implications of moving to a two year budget cycle for the Defense Department. The Secretary is encouraged to develop recommendations on the needed changes in current procedures in order to implement a two year budget process.

SEC. 910, CONTINUED OPERATION BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF THE DEFENSE DEPENDENT'S EDUCATION SYSTEM

The Department of Education Organization Act (Public Law 96-88) provided that administrative responsibility for the overseas schools of military dependents would be transferred from the Department of Defense to the Department of Education. The transfer was originally scheduled to be accomplished no later than May 4, 1983 (3 years after the effective date of the Act). However, the fiscal year 1983 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 97-252) extended the deadline for the transfer by 1 year. That extension, in turn, was further lengthened by the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 98-94) which provided that the transfer was not to take place any earlier than May 4, 1986.

For several years, the committee has strongly supported the continued operation of the overseas military schools by the Defense Department. Testimony by several organizations and individuals has made it clear that the more than 140,000 children enrolled in the overseas schools are receiving a very good education. Transferring responsibility for the schools' administration to the Education Department would not enhance an already excellent program of education. Instead, the committee believes that administrative, personnel, and intangible factors that have contributed to the schools' performance would be lost if they were transferred to the Department of Education.

First, several of the schools' administrative needs are now effectively met by the extensive network of Army, Navy, and Air Force support facilities and services. For example, military payroll offices handle many financial matters for the schools and their employees. These fiscal offices would not be transferred, so the Department of Education would either have to establish a separate financial management system to serve the overseas schools or have to "contract" with the military for the services of their payroll offices. Neither alternative would be as efficient or inexpensive as the current system. The Education Department would have this same problem in assuming responsibility for other essential services now provided by local military commanders on a nonreimbursable basis. These services include communications, mail delivery, shipment of supplies, contracting assistance, and security.

Second, the transfer of the schools could create personnel difficulties for their employees. Under the current NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA), teachers in the overseas schools are afforded special benefits and protections by the host countries, but only as long as they are employed directly by the Department of Defense. The transfer of these employees to the Education Department could jeopardize these privileges. Although the United States government could attempt to renegotiate the SOFA, it is very likely that host nations would extend SOFA benefits to additional personnel only with great reluctance and at the expense of some other concession.

Third, the committee is concerned that the morale of our military families would be affected if the close working relationship that has developed between overseas military installations and their schools were upset. Overseas military communities are no different than United States towns and counties in their strong desire to influence the education provided in their local schools. In fact, schools are especially important to communities like overseas military bases in which everyone shares a similar way of life in a foreign environment. This intangible but important association of military families with their schools would be diminished if the Department of Education were to replace the Defense Department in administering the overseas schools.

The most important testimony and information that the committee has received on this issue have been from those who are most deeply involved in the daily operation of the schools--parents and teachers. They have strongly supported the committee's efforts to repeal the transfer.

In order to ascertain the teachers' opinions, the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive survey. In the survey conducted on January 6, 1984, all classroom teachers, school nurses, guidance counselors, school psychologists, and social workers were asked whether the DoD overseas schools should be retained within the Defense Department or whether they should be transferred to the Education Department. Of the 7,614 ballots distributed to eligible teachers, a total of 6,794 (89.2 percent) valid ballots were returned for count. The results of the survey indicate that 5,130 (75.5 percent) voted for the retention of the schools in DoD and that 1,664 (24.5 percent) voted for the transfer to the Education Department. Therefore, the survey confirmed the committee's view that the overwhelming majority of teachers believe that their schools should continue to be administered by the Department of Defense. Moreover, their position is the same as that of the Defense Department, the Education Department, and the Overseas Federation of Teachers.

The House-Senate conferees on the fiscal year 1984 Defense Authorization Act expressed their concern "that the question of the transfer should be resolved as expeditiously as possible so that the uncertainty surrounding the transfer does not adversely affect the quality of education being provided". In an effort to resolve this issue, the committee again recommends that the scheduled transfer of DoD schools to the Department of Education be rescinded.

The initial part of the committee recommendation would amend the Department of Education Organization Act by repealing all those provisions related to the overseas dependents' schools system, its transfer and its planned administration by the Education Department. The second section would return the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education to the Department of Defense. Finally, the recommendation of the committee authorizes the Secretary of Defense to call upon the Secretary of Education for advice and technical support in the operation of the schools.

SEC. 911, EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO TRANSPORT HUMANITARIAN RELIEF SUPPLIES TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Last year the Congress enacted Section 1540 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525, 98 Stat 2637) to provide authority for the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1985, to transport on a space available basis, at no charge, to any country in Central America, goods and supplies which have been provided by a non-governmental source and which are intended for humanitarian assistance. The administration has drafted regulations implementing this provision and has received 11 formal written inquiries regarding the transportation of humanitarian supplies. To date, 2 of these inquiries have been favorably acted upon.

The committee recommends extension of this authority for fiscal year 1986. In addition, the committee recognizes that there are other regions in the world which are also in need of United States humanitarian assistance, and therefore also recommends the extension of this authority to the rest of the world. The committee believes that the administration has implemented the current authority in a professional and commendable manner, and would hope that the administration could implement the extension of this authority through the current regulations.

SEC. 912, INDUSTRIAL FUND CAPITALIZATION PROGRAM

In Section 912 of the bill, the Department of Defense is authorized to make the requested changes in the Industrial Fund Capitalization Program. The current language has the effect of forcing a minimum percentage be used in capitalization program efforts. This provision restricts the Department of Defense to budgeting and spending the funds only on these projects regardless of merit or priority. With the change in the bill, DOD will budget for capitalization projects as required, and consistent with the industrial activity needs rather than a fixed percentage.

SEC. 913, IMPLICATIONS OF THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

The committee adopted an amendment declaring that the Congress fully supports the declared policy of the President that a principal objective of the United States in the new negotiations on nuclear and space arms is to reverse the erosion of the ABM Treaty and that in approving funds for SDI research, the Congress does not express or imply an intention that the United States should abrogate, violate or otherwise erode the treaty, nor does it express or imply any determination or commitment on the part of the Congress that the United States deploy defense weaponry for use against strategic ballistic missiles that would contravene that accord.

SEC. 914, SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

In Section 914 of the bill, the committee authorized the $2.1 million requested for this program. The amount requested appears adequate to meet fiscal year 1986 requirements.

SEC. 915, RESTRICTION ON THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE B-1B BOMBER AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

The committee adopted an amendment declaring that none of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act may be obligated or expended for the conduct of research, design, demonstration, development, or procurement of more than 100 B-1B bomber aircraft (including any derivative or modified version of such aircraft) unless the Secretary of Defense first notifies the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of the specific purpose for which the funds are proposed to be used and the amount proposed to be expended for that purpose.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION

PURPOSE OF DIVISION B

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1986. The administration's request is reflected in S. 537 as introduced by request. This division, as approved by the Committee on Armed Services, totals $9,155,255,000 in authorization for appropriation. It provides construction in support of the Military Services, Guard and Reserve components, Defense Agencies, NATO Infrastructure, and includes military family housing requirements. Committee review resulted in a net reduction of $1,154,216,000 from the total $10,309,471,000 initially requested in new authorization for appropriation for fiscal year 1986.

A brief summary of the authorizations provided in Division B follows:

Authorization for Appropriations Granted, Fiscal Year 1986

Title I (Army):	
Inside the United States	1,040,600,000
Outside the United States	458,170,000
Unspecified minor construction	31,000,000
Planning and design	148,700,000
Family housing construction	286 999,000
Family housing support	1,271,794,000
Subtotal	3,237,263,000
Title II (Navy):	
Inside the United States	1,383,435,000
Outside the United States	221,195,000
Unspecified minor construction	21,560,000
Planning and design	143,260,000
Defense access roads	2,960,000
Family housing construction	154,000,000
Family housing support	587,839,000
Subtotal	2,514,249,000
Title III (Air Force):	
Inside the United States	1,032,117,000
Outside the United States	466,737,000
Unspecified minor construction	22,000,000
Planning and design	144,096,000
Defense access roads	30,240,000
Family housing construction	212,600,000
Family housing support	729,298,000
Subtotal	2,637,088,000
Title IV (Defense Agencies):	
Inside the United States	81,102,000
Outside the United States	106,598,000
Unspecified minor construction	4,000,000
Contingency construction	5,000,000

Planning and design	30,000,000
Family housing construction	1,800,000
Family housing support	18,500,000
Subtotal	247,000,000
Title V (NATO Infrastructure)	98,000,000
Title VI (Guard and Reserve Forces):	
Army National Guard	102,100,000
Army Reserve	70,900,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	51,800,000
Air National Guard	130,055,000
Air Force Reserve	66,800,000
Subtotal	421,655,000
Total authorization of appropriations	9,155,255,000

BACKGROUND

Military construction requirements for fiscal year 1986 identified in this legislation were developed on the same basis as the Department of Defense request presented to Congress for military procurement. This concept involves the so-called package-program method of identifying our military forces with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities necessary to discharge effectively these assigned mission responsibilities.

The Department of Defense initially requested authorization of appropriations in the amount of $10,309,471,000 for fiscal year 1986—slightly less than 2 percent below the $10,400,802,000 requested for fiscal year 1985 by the administration but more than 11 percent higher than the $9,133,908,000 authorized for appropriations for fiscal year 1985. One quarter of the initial fiscal year 1986 request was for operation and maintenance of military housing and the rest, $7.8 billion, was requested for new construction, including $500 million for planning and design. The $7.3 billion for construction places 76 percent in the United States, with 15 percent for bases in Europe, and 9 percent in other areas overseas.

The committee carefully assessed each proposal and project to assure that only those items which are essential to our national defense interests would be approved.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill was introduced as S. 537 and hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Armed Services. The subcommittee met on numerous occasions to thoroughly review more than 1700 individual projects involving approximately 700 military installations within the United States and overseas. After these extensive hearings the committee reduced the request by $1,154,216,000.

The following table indicates the changes made to the various titles of the bill.

CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE

[In thousands of dollars]

	DOD fiscal year 1986 request	Changes by committee	Total amount approved by committee
Sec. 2161—Army	3,649,674	−412,411	3,237,263
Sec. 2162—Navy	2,886,249	−372,000	2,514,249
Sec. 2163—Air Force	2,917,048	−279,960	2,637,088
Sec. 2164—Defense agencies	329,900	−82,900	247,000
Sec. 2165—NATO infrastructure	98,000	0	98,000
Sec. 2171—Guard and Reserve	428,600	−6,945	421,655
Total	10,309,471	−1,154,216	9,155,255

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

The committee has been able to support the request of the Department of Defense for increases in the military construction budget. The committee has authorized over $16 billion in the last 2 years for facilities in support of new weapons systems, modernization of the workplace, and quality of life for our servicemen and women and their families.

This year the Congress is faced with the difficult task of reconciling the need for military construction and family housing with the need to reduce the Nation's unacceptably high budget deficit. In the face of this dilemma, the committee agreed that reductions in budget authority of $1.2 billion be made in the military construction request. Such a reduction was not without significant consequences. Funding for important community facilities was deferred. For the most part, funds for operational maintenance and training facilities, as well as troop and family housing, were fully supported.

The committee believes that considerable investment remains to be made in order to replace and modernize aged facilities at our bases. This makes it imperative that the Department consider and propose for closure bases that put an excessive drain on already limited resources. The Department must move out more aggressively in order to realize savings for critical defense requirements. In this regard, the Department of Defense should seek adequate funding to meet these needs. In future budget submissions, it will be critical for the services to seek to maximize the construction value they receive for the taxpayers' money. Leadership, innovation, and insistence on excellence will remain cornerstones.

BASE CLOSURE

The committee believes that significant savings can be made from closing nonessential bases in the United States. There is no question that this is an extremely painful task. Many of these bases provide economic benefits to the local communities and, therefore, enjoy strong local support. However, the committee feels that the Nation can no longer afford that burden.

The committee, in a letter dated March 25, 1985, asked the Secretary of Defense to develop specific recommendations for base closure. The following is the reply of the Secretary of Defense on that matter:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, April 1, 1985.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BARRY: You asked the Department of Defense to elaborate on the way the illustrative list of base closures I provided to you was constructed.

The fundamental criterion used to determine whether a military base is a candidate for closing is whether its people and equipment can be relocated to an installation with sufficient land and facilities to assume its mission without compromising operational capability. A principal consideration in this process is whether the funds required to finance the relocation cost and construction of new facilities can be made available and, if so, whether closing the base, and possibly selling the real property, will produce substantial savings within an acceptable time.

Each of the Services strives to maintain a base structure that can support its operational and training requirements, accommodate planned force deployments, maximize the use of multi-mission installations, and respond to unprogrammed force beddowns. Therefore, not all military installations are considered each time base realignments are explored. Previous actions to consolidate, reduce, realign, and close bases have produced an efficient and responsive base structure. Requirements at most installations are relatively fixed because they support stable missions. While most bases experience variations in workload, the need for their land and physical plants continues.

Additionally, base realignments are very time sensitive. A list of candidates drafted at any point in time must be regarded as temporary because the conditions influencing its formulation are themselves temporary. For example, changes in missions, force structure, or the budget can cause changes in realignment proposals. Additionally, once a major construction program to accommodate a realigned mission is undertaken at a location, termination is uneconomical.

The list of bases furnished you was illustrative of the types of installations that might be considered for closure if Congress would pass expediting legislation and if required funds were added to the Defense request so we could relocate people and equipment and design and construct new facilities. Identification of alternative sites requires considerable study, and none has yet been selected.

The specific criteria used to construct the list furnished you were those routinely used by the Department. They are:

Mission requirements and the impact of potential force turbulence on operational readiness
Availability and condition of facilities at potential receiving installations
Potential to accommodate contingency and future force requirements at the new location
Capital investment at the present location
Budgetary implications of the proposal
Extent and timing of potential cost savings
Economic impact on the community
Community support at the new location
Environmental impact
Impact on other Services
Implementation period

Attached are exhibits that portray the rationale for each base realignment or closure action on the illustrative list I gave you. Each sheet also shows two timetables for the action and the costs and savings that result. One timetable assumes passage of the legislation you introduced. The second assumes the new legislation is not passed. It also assumes that no delays are imposed in the process either by Congress or through the courts. Past experience shows that Defense must assume that delays will occur. Almost every base closure proposal results in a concerted effort to block the action.

Closing an installation and relocating its mission to another installation that has an existing mission involves:

Military Construction at new location: operational facilities; barracks and housing; training and classroom facilities; adding or altering community support facilities (mess halls, hospital).
Personnel Relocation Costs.
Equipment Relocation Costs.

One-Time Savings: Cancellation of programmed improvements at closed installation.

Annual Recurring Costs: Caretaker costs at closed installation; Additional operating support costs at receiving installation.

Other costs include economic adjustment assistance at both the closed and the receiving installation. Proceeds may include the revenues from the sale of land and improvements.

Clearly the length of time it takes to accomplish this activity depends on whether existing Congressional impediments are removed and the money necessary to fund the replacement facilities is forthcoming.

The notional list furnished you was the product of a joint effort between the Military Departments and my office. Each of the Service Secretaries approved inclusion of the installations on the list.

The attachments spell out the proposed action at each installation on the notional list. I caution again that the list is illustrative, and that no closures or realignments are proposed in the FY 1986 budget. I am particularly concerned that programmed military construction at these installations not be cut simply because the installation appears on the notional list.

I also want to point out that not all actions are total closures. In many cases, New Cumberland and Letterkenny for example, only a minor realignment is proposed. Some of the illustrative actions do not involve relocations of entire missions; the Naval Air Rework Facility and the Naval Shipyard are examples. In these two cases, we have excess capacity at similar installations. Still, some equipment and people will have to be moved.

Some of the costs and savings on the attachments differ from those I gave you a few weeks ago. The reason is that the Military Departments have had more time to study the proposed actions. The figures in the attachments are not definitive either; a proper study of each installation, inlcuding realistic estimates of construction costs at alternative receiving locations, would take six months of full-time work.

I trust the information in this letter and the attachments will be useful to you as we work together to make certain the Department of Defense has an efficient, economical base structure.

Sincerely,

CASPAR WEINBERGER.

INSTALLATION

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close the facility and move mission essential activities to Fort Carson, Colorado.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Facility is expected to require significant modernization or replacement in the near future. Army would benefit by having the medical training program in the vicinity of a large military population.

	Milestone	Cost ($000) [2] (thousands)	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [1]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		[3] 2,550
1987	Design		
1988	Construction [4] [5]	$50,000	[6] 3,000
1989		50,300	3,000
1990		50,000	3,000
1991	Relocation	28,000	[7] 5,500
1992			22,100
1993			22,100
1994			[8] 22,100
Total		178,300	

	Milestone	Cost ($000) [2] (thousands)	Savings (thousands)
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [9]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986		[10] 200	2,550
1987	Decision		
1988	Design		
1989	Construction	50,000	3,000
1990		50,300	3,000
1991		50,000	3,000
1992	Relocation	28,000	5,500
1993			22,100
1994			22,100
Total		178,500	

---

[1] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1988.
[2] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.
[3] MCA project (physical fitness center) in the fiscal year 1986 MILCON budget would be eliminated. No significant impact.
[4] Construction estimates assume replacement of all facilities.
[5] Construction will take 3 years with relocation occurring in the fourth year.
[6] Annual savings commence with the first year of construction due to reduced maintenance and repair. Avoidance estimated at 25 percent of annual RPMA cost.
[7] Savings during the year of relocation is estimated at 25 percent of steady state.
[8] Annual savings estimates consist of the following: OMA(−), 10.1: RPMA, 4.4; HSC, 26.0; Champus, −17.6*; AFH, 1.7; total, 22.1.
[9] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1989.
[10] Funds to conduct an environmental impact statement.
*Assume Lowry AFB has no inpatient capability.

Note.—Years to amortize: 8.

INSTALLATION

Fort Ruger, Hawaii.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close out Army presence—offer facility to the Hawaii National Guard.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Hawaii National Guard is primary user. Army activity can be absorbed in existing facilities on the island.

	Milestone	Cost (thousand)[1] (no MCA)	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce decision *[2]	$20	
1986			[3] $150
1987			150
1988			150
1989			150
1990			150
1991			150
1992			150
1993			150
1994			150
Total		20	
	WITH OUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce decision *	20	
1986			150
1987			150
1988			150
1989			150

	Milestone	Cost (thousand)[1] (no MCA)	Savings (thousands)
1990			150
1991			150
1992			150
1993			150
1994			150
Total		20	

---

[1] Cost consist of relocating a small number of people and equipment.
[2] Assumes the Hawaii National Guard already operates this small installation.
[3] Annual savings consist of salaries of five full-time personnel that can be reapplied elsewhere.
*No study required due to small size of activity (less than 50 personnel).

Note.—Years to amortize: 1.

INSTALLATION

Fort Devens, Massachusetts.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close the facility and relocate the activities and units to other installations.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Administrative post with limited training area. Missions can be performed at other posts equally well, with attendant savings in support structure.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands)[1]	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION[2]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		[3] $600
1987	Design		
1988	Construction[4] [5]	$100,000	[6] 6,000
1989		80,800	6,000
1990		61,000	6,000
1991	Relocate	16,000	[7] 6,250
1992			25,200
1993			25,200
1994			[8] 25,200
Total		257,800	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION[9]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986		[10] $300	600
1987	Decision		
1988	Design		
1989	Construction	100,000	
1990		80,000	
1991		61,000	
1992	Relocation	16,000	6,250
1993			25,200
1994			25,200
Total		258,100	

---

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.
[2] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1988.
[3] MCA project (NBC training facility) in the fiscal year 1986 MILCON budget would be eliminated. No significant problems expected.
[4] Construction estimates assume replacement of all facilities.
[5] Construction will take 3 years with relocation occurring in the fourth year.
[6] Annual savings commence with the first year of construction due to reduced maintenance and repair. Avoidance estimated at 25 percent of annual RPMA cost.
[7] Savings during the year of relocation is estimated at 25 percent of steady state.

[8] Annual savings estimates consist of the following: OMA (−), 20.1; RPMA, 12.8; HSC, 7.9; Champus, −5.7; AFH, −9.9; Total, 25.2.
[9] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1989.
[10] Funds to conduct an environmental impact statement.

Note.—Years to amortize: 10.

INSTALLATION

Cameron Station, Alexandria, Virginia.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close the facility and move the mission essential elements to Ft. Belvoir, Virginia.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Small single purpose post on valuable real estate. Facilities need upgrade. Relocating in immediate proximity minimizes personal turbulence.

	Milestone	Cost thousands[1]	Savings thousands
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION[2]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		
1987	Design		
1988	Construction[3] [4]	$50,000	[5] $1,300
1989		33,250	1,300
1990	Relocation	550	[6] 3,000
1991			12,000
1992			12,000
1993			12,000
1994			[7] 12,000
Total		83,800	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION[8] [9]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986			
1987	Decision		
1988	Design		
1989	Construction	50,000	1,300
1990		33,250	1,300
1991	Relocation	550	3,000
1992			12,000
1993			12,000
1994			12,000
Total		83,800	

---

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.
[2] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1988.
[3] Construction estimates assume replacement of all facilities, except PX and commissary.
[4] Construction will take 2 years and relocation will occur in third year.
[5] Annual savings commence with the first year of construction due to reduced maintenance and repair. Avoidance estimated at 25 percent of annual RPMA cost.
[6] Savings during the year of relocation is estimated at 25 percent of steady state.
[7] Annual savings estimates consist of the following: OMA(−),7.8' RPMA, 4.2; total, 12.0.
[8] This case assumes earliest construction in 1989.

Note.—Years to amortize: 7.

INSTALLATION

Jefferson Proving Ground, Madison, Indiana.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close, transfer testing mission to other proving grounds.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Excess capacity in the system, allows consolidation of support structure and reduction of overhead.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands) [1]	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [2]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		
1987	Design		
1988	Construction	[3] $2,500	
1989		[3] 4,600	
1990	Relocate—begin	700	$500
1991		2,600	2,500
1992		300	3,000
1993		300	3,000
1994			3,000
Total		11,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [4]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986		[5] 200	
1987	Decision		
1988	Design		
1989	Construction	[3] 2,500	
1990		[3] 4,600	
1991	Relocate	700	500
1992		2,600	2,500
1993		300	3,000
1994		300	3,000
Total		11,200	

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.

[2] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1988.

[3] MCA.

[4] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1989.

[5] Funds to conduct an environmental impact statement.

Note.—Years to amortize: 4.

INSTALLATION

Fort Wingate Army Depot Activity, Gallup, New Mexico.

PROPOSED ACTION

Closure, relocate ammunition stocks to other depots.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Under utilized facility, excess capacity at other depots would allow this closure and subsequent reduction in overhead cost. Facility would be offered to the New Mexico National Guard.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands) [1]	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	(2)	
1996	Decision		[3] $490
1987	Relocate	$1,100	100
1988		5,400	1,100
1989		6,500	2,800
1990		3,000	4,000

	Milestone	Cost (thousands) [1]	Savings (thousands)
1991		1,000	4,000
1992			4,000
1993			4,000
1994			4,000
Total		17,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986		[4] 300	
1987	Decision		490
1988	Relocate	1,100	100
1989		5,400	1,100
1990		6,500	2,800
1991		3,000	4,000
1992		1,000	4,000
1993			4,000
1994			4,000
Total		17,300	

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.

[2] No. MCA.

[3] MCA project (ammo loading docks) in the fiscal year 1986 MILCON budget request would be eliminated. This would have no significant effect if we close the installation.

[4] Funds to conduct an environmental impact statement.

Note.—Years to amortize: 4.

INSTALLATION

Army Materiel & Mechanics Research Center, Watertown, Massachusetts.

PROPOSED ACTION

Closure, transfer functions to other laboratories.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Facilities need major renovation; integration of R&D related functions.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands) [1]	Saving (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [2]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		[3] $770
1987	Design		
1988	Construction [4]	[5] $1,500	
1989		[5] 8,700	
1990	Relocate—begin	[5] 5,000	500
1991		800	3,000
1992		2,800	4,000
1993		1,200	4,000
1994			4,000
Total		20,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION [6]		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986		[7] 200	770
1987	Decision		
1988	Design		
1989	Construction	[5] 1,500	
1990		[5] 8,700	

	Milestone	Cost (thousands)[1]	Saving (thousands)
1991	Relocate—begin	[5] 5,000	500
1992		800	3,000
1993		2,800	4,000
1994		1,200	4,000
Total		20,200	

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.

[2] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1988.

[3] MCA project (pollution abatement and one set family quarters) in the in fiscal year 1986 MILCON budget which would be eliminated. No significant problems expected.

[4] Construction will take 3 years with relocation commencing in the third year.

[5] MCA.

[6] This case assumes earliest construction in fiscal year 1989.

[7] Funds to conduct an envoronmental impact statement.

Note.—years to amortize: 5.

INSTALLATION

General Materiel & Petroleum Activity, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

PROPOSED ACTION

Transfer this functional activity to the Troop Support Command, St. Louis, Missouri.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Consolidate administrative overhead; integrate materiel management responsibilities; increase automation support.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands)[1]	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	([2])	
1986	Decision		
1987	Relocate	$200	$100
1988		1,600	900
1989		200	1,000
1990			1,000
1991			1,000
1992			1,000
1993			1,000
Total		2,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		
1987	Relocate	$200	$100
1988		1,600	900
1989		200	1,000
1990			1,000
1991			1,000
1992			1,000
1993			1,000
Total		2,000	

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.

[2] No MCA.

Note.—New Cumberland Army Depot remains open.

Note.—No MCA.

INSTALLATION

Philadelphia Support Activity, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

PROPOSED ACTION

Transfer mission to Troop Support Command, St. Louis, Missouri.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Consolidate administrative overhead; integrate materiel management responsibilities; increase automation support.

	Milestone	Cost (thousands)[1]	Savings (thousands)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	(2)	
1986	Decision		
1987	Relocate	$400	$100
1988		1,000	400
1989		500	1,000
1990		100	1,000
1991			1,000
1992			1,000
1993			1,000
Total		2,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		
1987	Relocate	$400	$100
1988		1,000	400
1989		500	1,000
1990		100	1,000
1991			1,000
1992			1,000
1993			1,000
Total		2,000	

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant fiscal year 1985 dollars.
[2] No MCA.

Note.—Years to amortize: 2.

INSTALLATION

Logistics Systems Support Activity, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

PROPOSED ACTION

Consolidate the Logistics System Support Activity with the Automated Logistical Materiel Support Activity, St. Louis, Missouri.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Combine two central design activities; allows consolidation of overhead and improved productivity.

	Milestone	Cost (thousand)[1]	Savings (thousand)
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	(2)	
1986	Decision		

	Milestone	Cost (thousand) [1]	Savings (thousand)
1987	Relocate	1,200	600
1988		3,400	2,000
1989		1,800	3,000
1990		600	3,000
1991			3,000
1992			3,000
1993			3,000
Total		7,000	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	Decision		
1987	Relocate	1,200	600
1988		3,400	2,000
1989		1,800	3,000
1990		600	3,000
1991			3,000
1992			3,000
1993			3,000
Total		7,000	

---

[1] All cost and savings estimates reflect constant 1985 dollars.

[2] No, MCA.

Note.—Years to amortize: 2.
Note.—Letterkenny Army Depot remains open.

BASE REALIGNMENTS

INSTALLATION

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close Aircraft Depot (NARF).

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Excess depot capacity; transfer workload to other NARF's.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISIATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Implementation	24	
1987	Savings start	4	20
1988			31
1989			31
1990			31
1991			31
1992			31
1993			31
1994			31
Total		28	
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Years to amortize: 3.			
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA Process	1	
1987	Announce decision		

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	Approval and congesssional review		
	Implementation	23	
1988	Savings Start	4	20
1989			31
1990			31
1991			31
1992			31
1993			31
1994			31
Total		28	
Years to amortize: 4.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Naval Regional Medical Center, Oakland.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close Hospital.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Medical services can be provided at Presidio; Transfer training function to San Diego.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal Year:			
1985	Announce study and decision	2	
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Construction	23	
1987	Implementation	5	
1988	Savings start		10
1989			16
1990			16
1991			16
1992			16
1993			16
1994			16
Total		30	
Years to amortize: 5.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process		
	Design	1	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and congressional review	1	
1988	Construction	23	
1989	Implementation	5	
1990	Savings start		10
1991			16
1992			16
1993			16
1994			16
Total		30	
Years to amortize: 7.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Camp H.M. Smith, HI.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Consolidate Headquarters functions at Fort Shafter.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Implementation	5	
1987	Savings Start		2
1988		2	
1989		2	
1990		2	
1991		2	
1992		2	
1993		2	
1994		2	
Total	5		
Years to amortize: 4.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process	1	
1987	Approval and congressional review		
	Implementation	4	
1988	Savings start		2
1989		2	
1990		2	
1991		2	
1992		2	
1993		2	
1994		2	
Total	5		
Years to amortize: 5.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Naval Station, Seattle, WA.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close single mission administrative facility.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Relocate function to neighboring bases.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Construction	36	
1987	Implementation	2	

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
1988	Savings start		5
1989			9
1990			9
1991			9
1992			9
1993			9
1994			9
Total		38	
Years to amortize: 7.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process		
	Design	3	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and congressional review	2	
1988	Construction	32	
1989	Implementation	1	
1990	Savings start		5
1991			9
1992			9
1993			9
1994			9
Total		38	
Years to amortize: 9.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, PA.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close Shipyard.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Excess Depot capacity; transfer workload to other shipyards.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Implementation	75	
1987	Savings start	5	40
1988			57
1989			57
1990			57
1991			57
1992			57
1993			57
1994			57
Total		80	
Years to amortize: 3.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process	5	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and congressional review		
	Implementation	70	

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
1988	Savings start	5	40
1989			57
1990			57
1991			57
1992			57
1993			57
1994			57
Total		80	
Years to amortize: 4.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Naval Complex, Great Lakes, IL.

PROPOSED ACTION

Closure.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Relocate to Other Bases.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
	Design	35	
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Construction	876	
1987	Implementation	140	
1988	Savings start	64	32
1989			54
1990			54
1991			54
1992			54
1993			54
1994			54
Total		1,115	
Years to amortize: 23.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process		
	Design	11	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and Congressional review	25	
1988	Construction	875	
1989	Implementation	140	
1990	Savings Start	64	32
1991			54
1992			54
1993			54
1994			54
Total		1,115	
Years to amortize: 25.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

NAS South Weymouth, MA.

PROPOSED ACTION

Closure.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Relocate Reserve Air Training to another Base.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal Year:			
1985	Announce study and decision		
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Construction	18	
1987	Implementation	5	
1988	Savings start		6
1989			9
1990			9
1991			9
1992			9
1993			9
1994			9
Total		23	
Years to amortize: 5.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process		
	Design	1	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and congressional review	1	
1988	Construction	16	
1989	Implementation	5	
1990	Savings start		6
1991			9
1992			9
1993			9
1994			9
Total		23	
Years to amortize: 7.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

NADC Warminster, PA.

PROPOSED ACTION

Closure.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Relocate aircraft technology mission.

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study and decision	5	
1986	Approval and congressional review		
	Construction	68	

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
1987	Implementation	7	
1988	Savings start		30
1989			45
1990			45
1991			45
1992			45
1993			45
1994			45
Total		80	
Years to amortize: 5.			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study		
1986	NEPA process		
	Design	5	
1987	Announce decision		
	Approval and congressional review		
1988	Construction	68	
1989	Implementation	7	
1990	Savings start		30
1991			45
1992			45
1993			45
1994			45
Total		80	
Years to amortize: 7.			

Note.—Costs and savings in millions of dollars.

INSTALLATION

Chicago-O'Hare IAP, Chicago, IL.

PROPOSED ACTION

Inactivate reserve component units; redistribute missions and resources to other units.*

*Requires coordination/approval of governor for ANG unit.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Example of a base that has conflicts with civil aviation. Potential for resale of land for development/expansion of civil aviation activities.

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	0.15	
1986	MCP approval/design	5.80	
1987	Construction	57.70	
1988	Implementation	6.50	
1989	Closure: savings start		7.0
1990	Savings		7.0
1991	Savings		7.0
1992	Savings	7.0	
1993	Savings		7.0
1994	Savings		7.0
Total		70.15	

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
Years to amortize: 10 years (fiscal year 1998).			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	0.20	
1986	NEPA/decision	.20	
1987	Congressional/approval/design	5.80	
1988	Construction	57.70	
1989	Implementation	6.50	
1990	Closure: savings start		7.0
1990	Savings		7.0
1991	Savings		7.0
1992	Savings		7.0
1993	Savings		7.0
1994	Savings		7.0
Total		70.40	
Years to amortize: 10 years (fiscal year 1999).			

Note.—Based on fiscal year 1985 dollars.

INSTALLATION

McConnell AFB, Kansas

PROPOSED ACTION

Close. Redistribute KC-135s to other refueling wings. Change selected B-1B location to another SAC base (will impact B-1B operational readiness).

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Example of a base losing its major mission (Titan II ICBM retirement); status of base reviewed prior to expenditure of funds for new mission (B-1B). (Approval of military construction funds requested for fiscal year 1986 would eliminate this base as an example of a closure candidate.)

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal Year:			
1985	Announce study	0.25	
1986	MCP approval/design	18.00	[1] 71.5
1987	Construction	100.00	
1988	Construction	80.00	
1989	Implementation	12.00	
1990	Closure: savings start		43.0
1991	Savings		43.0
1992	Savings		43.0
1993	Savings		43.0
1994	Savings		43.0
Total		210.25	
Years to amortize: 4 years (fiscal year 1983).			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	.25	
1986	NEPA decision	.75	[1] 71.5
1987	Cong approval/design	18.00	
1988	Construction	100.00	
1989	Construction	80.00	
1990	Implementation/relocation	11.00	

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
1991	Closure: savings start		43.0
1992	Savings		43.0
1993	Savings		43.0
1994	Savings		43.0
Total		210.00	
Years to amortize: 4 years (fiscal year 1994).			

---

[1] One time.

Note—Based on fiscal year 1985 dollars.

INSTALLATION

W.K. Kellogg, Battle Creek, MI.

PROPOSED ACTION

Inactivate unit and redistribute aircraft to other units.*
*Requires coordination/approval of governor for ANG unit.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Example of a base with an aging weapon system, aging facilities and runway limitations.

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	0.10	
1986	MCP approval/design	4.20	[1] 1.7
1987	Construction	41.30	
1988	Implementation	4.50	
1989	Closure: savings start		2.0
1990	Savings		2.0
1991	Savings		2.0
1992	Savings		2.0
1993	Savings		2.0
1994	Savings		2.0
Total		50.10	
Years to amortize: 25 years (fiscal year 2013).			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	0.10	
1986	NEPA/decision	.15	[1] 1.7
1987	Congressional approval/design	4.20	
1988	Construction	41.30	
1989	Implementation	4.50	
1990	Closure: savings start		2.0
1990	Savings		2.0
1991	Savings		2.0
1992	Savings		2.0
1993	Savings		2.0
1994	Savings		2.0
Total		50.25	
Years to amortize: 25 years (fiscal year 2014).			

---

[1] One time.

Note.—Based on fiscal year 1985 dollars.

INSTALLATION

Blytheville AFB, Arkansas.

PROPOSED ACTION

Close installation and redistribute B-52s and KC-135s to other SAC bases.

RATIONALE FOR SELECTION

Example of a base with a single mission.

[In millions of dollars]

	Milestone	Cost	Savings
	WITH EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1986	Announce study	0.25	
1987	MCP approval/design	18.00	[1] 3.7
1988	Construction	100.00	
1989	Construction	75.00	
1990	Implementation	12.00	
1991	Closure: savings start		41.0
1992	Savings		41.0
1993	Savings		41.0
1994	Savings		41.0
Total		205.25	
Years to amortize: 5 (fiscal year 1994).			
	WITHOUT EXPEDITING LEGISLATION		
Fiscal year:			
1985	Announce study	0.25	
1986	NEPA	.50	[1] 3.7
1987	NEPA/Decision		
1988	Cong approval/design	18.0	
1989	Construction	100.00	
1990	Construction	75.00	
1991	Implementation	12.00	
1992	Closure: savings start		41.0
1993	Savings		41.0
1994	Savings		41.0
Total		205.75	
Years to amortize: 5 (fiscal year 1996).			

[1] One time.

Note.—Based on fiscal year 1985 dollars.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the committee not later than July 1, 1985, a listing of all existing military installations in the United States, including those reflected in the Secretary's April 1, 1985, letter showing the relative importance of the installations to Defense Department missions. Such report should indicate into which of the following categories each installation falls: is absolutely essential, is important, is not of great importance but could not be considered marginal, is of marginal significance, and is easily subject to consolidation.

The report should also consider the following factors in making the categorizations: size of the installation and opportunities to consolidate other activities into the installation, investment in the installation, necessity of the mission performed at the installation, need for dispersion of capabilities for strategic reasons, need for dispersion of installations in order to obtain training resources (for example, air space for flight training), new investment required to achieve consolidation, and life cycle costs of operating facilities.

Section 772 streamlines the legal procedures required for the Defense Department to close a base if the Federal budget is in deficit. It further provides that the Secretary of Defense is authorized to design and construct such facilities as he determines are necessary to effect the closure or realignment of any military installation, and the Secretary may use for the design and construction of such facilities any funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction.

The committee's decision not to fund any particular military construction project requested by the Defense Department or the military services for fiscal year 1986 is not an implied or expressed decision to close any military base or installation.

FORT DRUM

This year the Army requested funds to begin the stationing of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, NY. Such stationing would require considerable expansion to the existing base infrastructure. The committee deferred these requests because of budget constraints.

NAVY HOMEPORTING

The Navy is currently expanding to meet the goal of a force of 600 ships. With this increase comes the requirement for increased port facilities. In this year's request, the Department has sought funding totaling $36 million to open two new ports, one to support a battleship surface action group at Staten Island, NY, and one for a carrier battle group at Everett, WA. The total military construction cost of facilities for these two ports is estimated at $750 million. However, a substantial part of these funds would be required to homeport these new ships whether new or existing ports are used.

The committee has approved the initial projects requested for both of these facilities, subject to a requirement that no funds authorized to be appropriated in this act for naval strategic homeporting may be obligated or expended until 90 days have elapsed following the submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy justifying the expenditures of such funds on the basis of military necessity and cost effectiveness.

VULNERABILITY OF BASES

Serious concerns have been raised by the committee as to the vulnerability of our bases to enemy attack. In this regard, the Secretary of Defense is directed to study and report to the committee by October 1, 1985, on the vulnerability of all bases in the United States and overseas and where it is most urgent to take corrective action.

STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION AND DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILES

The committee continues to support facilities for deployment of new weapons systems. Of particular note are the facilities for the ground-launched cruise missiles [GLCM] scheduled for the Netherlands. These missiles are an integral part of our NATO defense and demonstrate the resolve of the NATO Alliance to counter the growing Warsaw Pact intermediate range missiles force. Recognizing that the Government of the Netherlands intends to make its final decision in November 1985 on deployment, the committee has authorized funding, contingent on a favorable decision.

THIRD-PARTY FINANCING

The committee believes that third-party financing, wherein the private sector finances, designs, builds, and operates a facility and sells a product or a service from that facility to the military under a long-term contract, may be a viable alternative to the traditional approach of providing Federal funds for the design and construction and operating the facility with a Federal work force or a contractor work force paid for by Federal funds. The committee has recommended that the Services seek to enter into third-party contracts for heat and power plants and a pilot effort is underway for child care centers. The conferees to the fiscal year 1985 Military Construction Act agreed not to consider future child care center projects until this pilot effort is complete. The committee notes that progress has been disappointing to date. The Services have been reluctant to select candidate projects. In addition, contracting procedures have become cumbersome. In order to gain the benefits, the Services must aggressively pursue the third-party option and develop streamlined procedures and guidance. Therefore, funding has been denied for child care centers in CONUS, despite the need for most projects. In addition, the committee has deferred consideration of the financing for the Army's Eastern Distribution Center at New Cumberland, PA and the industrial waste water treatment plant at the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant in Missouri, pending review of potential third-party financing.

REPROGRAMMING FUNDS IN THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

The committee understands that it is the Department's policy to submit notification of actions to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House and Senate for the reprogramming of funds in the military construction accounts. In the past, however, this committee has not received all such notices. This committee expects to be notified of all reprogramming actions in military construction.

SANTA MARGARITA WATER PROJECT

Although, the committee agrees with the requirement, it did not authorize $148 million for the Defense Department to fund the Department's share of a water project to provide an adequate water supply and flood protection for Navy, Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton, CA. The Department would share the cost with the

Fallbrook Public Utility District, the cobeneficiary. However, the Public Works Committees of the Congress have not authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to construct the project and the Navy and the Fallbrook District have been unable to reach a meeting of the minds on the scope of the project for authorization to be possible.

INAPPLICABILITY OF DAVIS-BACON ACT TO MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Section 711 waives the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act for the construction of any project authorized by this or any other act authorizing the construction of military projects.

RIPLEY, WV, ARMY RESERVE

Last year the committee directed the Department to utilize savings for the design and construction of this Army Reserve Center. This project is now at the 35 percent design level, with total design expected to be completed by June. The committee expects that the Department will go forward this year with the bid phase to complete construction.

NAVY MINOR CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

The committee directs the Department of the Navy to provide funding from the unspecified minor construction account for the following two projects:

(1) Small arms range—$720,000—Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, MS. This project is needed to support the homeporting of the Ninth Active Duty Naval Mobile Construction Battalion at Gulfport, as provided in the fiscal year 1985 Department of Defense Authorization and Appropriations Acts. This range will also be used by other military activities in the area, including the National Guard.

(2) Security fence—$450,000—Meridian Naval Air Station, Meridian, MS. This security fence is urgently needed for reasons of aircraft safety and munitions security.

AIR FORCE MINOR CONSTRUCTION ACCOUNT

The committee directs the Department of the Air Force to provide funding from the unspecified minor construction account for the following two projects at Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, MS:

(1) Medical storage [WRM]—$960,000. WRM storage is currently housed in a semipermanent World War II building originally constructed as a training facility. This building is a makeshift warehouse that does not meet present or future mission requirements and is located across the base from the hospital which promotes inefficient operations.

(2) Petroleum operations facility—$580,000. The present facility is a semipermanent World War II building also used as a fuel storage office, with open-flame heaters, presenting serious fire and safety hazards.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD—PEARL AND HANCOCK COUNTIES, MS

The committee directs the Department of the Army to initiate planning and design in cooperation with the Military Traffic Management Command [MTMC] for Texas Flat Road—a defense access road which provides access to the Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant and which also serves the National Space Technological Laboratories. This project, as appropriate, should be included in the fiscal year 1987 military construction budget request.

DESIGN OF RUNWAY/TAXIWAY EXTENSION, MERIDIAN NAVAL AIR STATION

The committee directs the Department of the Navy to proceed with the design of a runway/taxiway extension at Meridian Naval Air Station. The acceleration of the design of this project is urgently needed for reasons of aircraft safety and deficiency of operations. This project as appropriate should be included in the fiscal year 1987 military construction authorization budget.

MICROCOMPUTER TRAINING COURSES, MERIDIAN NAVAL AIR STATION

Last year, the committee directed the Department of the Navy to proceed with the design of a training services building at Meridian Naval Air Station to develop and implement training for the use of microcomputers for applications aboard deploying units and at shore installations. Since that time, the situation has changed and a large shipment of microcomputers was delivered to Meridian Naval Air Station. Therefore, this year the committee recommends that the Department of the Navy establish Navywide training courses at Meridian Naval Air Station, using 160 new microcomputers already on hand in existing facilities, while continuing the design of needed computer training facilities.

RESTRICTIONS OF PORT HUENEME CONSTRUCTION

Port Hueneme is the only deep water seaport between Los Angeles and San Francisco. The committee believes that both military and commercial needs can be carried on at this important seaport and that an era of mutual support between the Navy and the Oxnard Harbor District must be maintained. Accordingly, the committee directs that no funds for the Weapon Systems Engineering buildings, Seabee Materiel Transit Facility, or Seabee Operations headquarters may be obligated until a mutual license agreement whereby property and wharfage can be used reciprocally in exchange for payment of a fair fee is reinstated similar to the license agreement which existed from 1956 until 1983.

HOUSING CONDITIONS—SELFRIDGE AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE, MOUNT CLEMENS, MI

The committee is aware of particularly acute problems with the housing conditions at Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, MI. The installation is one of the major military bases in the United States operated by the Air National Guard and one of the few installations where Active and Reserve units from all armed services are located. The base's housing area is operated by the Army because it supports the housing needs of the service's major subordinate command responsible for research, development, and acquisition of all Army (and some Marine Corps) tracked combat and wheeled vehicles—the Tank-Automotive Command in Warren, MI. It also provides housing for military personnel and their dependents from the other services.

A growing number of complaints has been received about this housing, including that some personnel are living in units once condemned by the Air Force and that some experienced Navy personnel have chosen to leave that service rather than accept assignment to Selfridge, where they would be required to reside in the deficient onbase housing.

The committee believes that there is an obligation to provide good quality onbase housing to military personnel and their dependents. Accordingly, the Army is directed to address the housing problems at Selfridge as a high priority matter, and to consider, along with the other armed services, how these problems might be solved during fiscal year 1986. Such considerations should include allocating additional funding resources to the operations and maintenance and military construction accounts to upgrade these facilities in fiscal year 1986, initiating feasibility studies and design efforts in fiscal year 1986 to begin replacing this housing in fiscal year 1987, and relaxing any regulations requiring onbase residence by military personnel at Selfridge in cases of hardship due to the deficient housing. The Army is directed to submit no later than October 1, 1985, a detailed report of its considerations, including any reasons why it will or will not carry out the actions listed above as possible solutions to the housing problems and including a specific plan with schedule milestones and funding profiles for eliminating these problems commencing in fiscal year 1986.

RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING FACILITY AT THE NATIONAL SECURITY HEADQUARTERS COMMAND, FORT MEADE, MD

Section 2144 authorizes the National Security Agency to contract for the design and construction of a research and engineering facility at its Fort Meade headquarters compound. The Agency's research and engineering needs have outgrown current spaces, whose dispersed locations and other inadequacies impede effective management of this critical function. The committee is pursuaded that it will be significantly less costly to build the required facility than to lease comparable space with the special characteristics that NSA needs for its research and engineering work. The committee intends that the facility authorized by this act include all appropriate special structural, equipment, and security features.

Section 2144 authorizes the design and construction of the entire facility, in advance of full appropriations thereof, through the use of a single continuous contract. Authorization of appropriations for the project, however, are limited to $21,364,000. The committee expects that funds for the project will be provided incrementally over a 3-year period.

TITLE I—ARMY

The Army request under title I amounted to $3,650,755,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Army request, approves the following programs.

	Army request	Total authorization
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	$1,362,590,000	$1,096,600,000
Outside the United States	494,220,000	488,170,000
Design	136,100,000	148,700,000
Minor construction	31,000,000	31,000,000
Total, military construction	2,023,910,000	1,764,470,000
Military family housing:		
Construction, improvements, and design	356,051,000	288,080,000
Support	1,270,794,000	1,271,794,000
Total, family housing	1,626,845,000	1,559,874,000
Grand total, Army authorization	3,650,755,000	3,324,344,000
Less:		
Military construction reduction for prior year savings		−56,000,000
Military construction general reduction for favorable currency rates in Europe and the Pacific:		
Korea		−7,000,000
Europe		−23,000,000
Family housing, Fort Ord, CA, trailer site construction authorization only		−1,081,000
Grand total, Army authorization for appropriation		3,237,263,000

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the military construction, Army, program as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Army request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
U.S. Army Forces Command	635,420	551,240
U.S. Army Western Command	40,910	40,910
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command	325,130	294,130
Military District of Washington	8,300	8,300
U.S. Army Materiel Command	234,250	122,570
Army Ammunition Plants	46,950	15,950
U.S. Army Intellience and Security Command	6,850	0
U.S. Army Information Systems Command	2,780	2,050
U.S. Military Academy	31,000	31,000
U.S. Army Health Services Command	12,270	9,720
U.S. Army Military Traffic Management Command	4,730	4,730

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Army request	Committee approved
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Command	11,000	11,000
Special Project	3,000	3,000
Total, inside the United States	1,362,590	1,096,600
Outside the United States:		
U.S. Army, Japan	1,050	1,050
Eighth U.S. Army	152,130	146,080
Ballistics Missile Defense Systems Command	14,600	14,600
U.S. Army Forces Command	7,680	7,680
U.S. Army, Europe	318,760	318,760
Total, outside the United States	494,220	488,170
Minor construction	31,000	31,000
Design	136,100	148,700
Total support	167,100	179,700
Total, military construction authorization	2,023,910	1,764,470
Less:		
Military construction reduction for prior years savings		−56,000
Military construction general reduction for favorable currency rates in Europe and the Pacific:		
Korea		−7,000
Europe		−23,000
Total, military construction authorization for appropriation		1,678,470

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Facility category	Army request	Committee approved
Operations and training	313,340	289,400
Maintenance and production	453,920	419,420
Army ammunition plants	46,950	15,950
Research, development, test and evaluation	31,250	31,250
Supply	153,000	58,690
Medical	113,000	113,000
Administrative	70,060	70,060
Housing and community	511,470	444,930
Utilities and ground improvements	163,820	142,070
Minor construction	31,000	31,000
Planning and design	136,100	148,700
Total, military construction	2,023,910	1,764,470
Less:		
Military construction reduction for prior year savings		−56,000
Military construction general reduction for favorable currency rates in Europe and the Pacific:		
Korea		−7,000
Europe		−23,000
Total, military construction authorization for appropriation		1,678,470

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $19,540,000 for two pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $28,090,000 for 21 energy conservation investment projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for most of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $551,240,000 for 98 projects at the following 20 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Bragg, NC:	
Antiarmor range	$4,050
Sniper training range	1,200
Aviation fuel storage facility	2,550
Division headquarters	6,700
Energy monitoring system expansion	2,750
Battalion headquarters	1,500
Ammunition storage	490
Tactical equipment shop	11,000
Company operations and supply	1,650
Aircraft maintenance hanger	9,400
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	13,000
Test equipment calibration facility	570
Flight simulator building	3,100
Runway extension	770
Total	58,730
Fort Campbell, KY:	
Flight simulator building	2,550
Tactical equipment shop	7,200
Multipurpose range complex—light	16,000
Railroad track acquisition	450
Total	26,200
Fort Carson, CO:	
Military operations on urbanized terrain	4,550
Multipurpose range complex—heavy	24,000
Battalion headquarters	1,350
Tactical equipment shop	12,600
Company operations and supply addition	1,100
Company operations and supply	2,100
Range roads—phase II	3,050
Total	48,750
Fort Hood, TX:	
Administration and test support facility	8,300
Aircraft maintenance facility	15,000
Aircraft maintenance facilities	29,000
Tactical equipment shop	1,050

Location and project	*Thousands*
Do	5,600
Total	58,950
Fort Hunter-Liggett, CO:	
Technical documentation facility	2,200
Multipurpose range complex—Light	8,900
Total	11,100
Fort Indiantown Gap, PA: Centralized wash facility	5,300
Fort Irwin, CA:	
Hospital upgrade and addition	8,000
Dining facility modernization	1,250
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	14,600
Training facility	1,100
Training ranges	1,750
Total	26,700
Fort Lewis, WA:	
Madigan Army Medical Center Phase II	26,000
Barracks with dining facility	[1]12,600
Utilities	6,900
Military operations on urbanized terrain	4,000
Tactical equipment shop	3,000
Do	6,100
Do	11,600
Aircraft maintenance hangar	10,800
Battalion headquarters	1,250
Do	630
Company operations and supply	4,800
Tactical equipment shop	4,650
Do	5,100
Battalion hadquarters	2,500
Group headquarters	2,100
Unaccompanied enlisted housing complex	21,000
Tactical equipment shop	2,700
Aircraft maintenance hangar	3,350
Total [1]	129,080
Fort McCoy, WI: Ammunition storage	940
Fort Meade, MD: Satellite communications terminal building	18,000
Record fire range upgrade	930
Total	18,930
Fort Ord, CA:	
Operations building	1,700
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	23,000
Energy monitoring and control system	440
Medical supply warehouse	680
Total	25,820
Fort Polk, LA:	
Company operations and supply	3,600
Do	2,200
Battalion headquarters	1,050
Do	1,150
Tactical equipment shop	10,000
Company operations and supply	980

[1] Revised Army cost estimate.

Location and project	*Thousands*
Battalion headquarters	1,250
Total	20,230
Fort Richardson, AK:	
Dining facility modernization	2,050
Operations building	1,550
Total	3,600
Fort Riley, KS:	
Tactical equipment shop	3,100
Aircraft maintenance hangar	7,600
Do	8,800
Military operations on urbanized terrain	5,000
Battalion headquarters	1,100
Tactical equipment shop	10,000
Do	2,750
Tactical equipment shop addition	2,800
Hardstand	2,100
Electrical upgrade	790
Company operations and supply	1,950
Dental clinic	3,300
Total	49,290
Fort Sam Houston, TX:	
Energy monitoring system expansion	940
Heat recovery system	500
Total	1,440
Fort Sheridan, IL: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,500
Fort Stewart, GA:	
Dining facility modernization	1,150
Military operations on urbanized terrain	3,700
Sniper training range	1,150
Tactical equipment shop	8,500
Do	8,600
Vehicle wash facility	6,500
Total	29,600
Fort Wainwright, AK:	
Barracks modernization	12,000
Steam line insulation	2,000
Total	14,000
Presidio of Monterrey, CA: Military Personnel Administration Center	2,650
Yakima Firing Center, WA:	
Range operations facility	630
Multipurpose range complex—light	15,800
Total	16,430

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Bragg, NC:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	[4] $2,950
Physical fitness training center	2,000
Fort Campbell, KY:	
Radiant heaters	[1] 430
Physical fitness training center	5,900
Fort Carson, CO:	
Child care center	[2] 2,600

Location and project	*Thousands*
Phycial fitness training center	4,100
Fort Devens, MA: NEC defense instruction facility	610
Fort Drum, NY:	
Fire station	990
Child care center	[2]2,000
Fort Greely, AK: Child care center	[2]2,500
Fort Hood, TX: Tactical equipment shop	[3]7,700
Fort Irwin, CA:	
Community center	1,900
Child care center	[2]1,450
Fort Lewis, WA:	
Barracks with dining facility	[4]4,850
Child care center	[2]7,800
Fort Polk, LA:	
Tactical equipment shop	[1]11,200
Physical fitness training center	7,000
Fort Riley, KS: Tactical equipment shop	[1]9,500
Fort Stewart, GA: Tactical equipment shop	[4]6,100

All projects deferred without prejudice due to budget constraints unless otherwise noted.

[1] Review scope and cost.
[2] Deferred pending 3d party financing test.
[3] Late award in fiscal year.
[4] Review requirement.

U.S. ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

The commander of the U.S. Army Western Command (WESTCOM) commands and supports assigned and attached Active and Army Reserve units, installations and activities in Hawaii and possessions and trust territories in the Pacific administered by the United States.

The committee approved $40,910,000 for 12 projects at the following 3 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Shafter, HI: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	$6,300
Phoakuloa training area, HI: Ammunition storage	2,150
Schofield Barracks, HI:	
Security fence with land acquisition	510
Tactical equipment shop	11,200
Dining facility modernization	2,700
Operations building	1,550
Company combined arms assault course	1,850
Military operations on urbanized terrain	3,850
Install electrical outlets	400
Air conditioning upgrade	5,900
Tactical equipment shop	3,650
Automated field fire range	850
Total	32,460

U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) is responsible for the Army school system and the principal combat development activities of the Army. It is responsible for individual training for members of the active Army and for Army Reserve component personnel assigned to TRADOC school and activities.

The committee approved $294,130,000 for 44 projects at the following 17 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort A.P. Hill, VA:	
Water distribution system	$600
Heating system	3,500
General purpose and cold storage warehouse	2,350
Total	6,450
Fort Belvoir, VA:	
Intelligence command and control facility	30,000
Automated data processing facility	4,300
Total	34,300
Fort Ben Harrison, IN: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,300
Fort Benning, GA:	
Highway crossing—U.S. 280	9,400
Ranger camp modifications	5,100
Trainee barracks	17,000
Tactical equipment shop	4,550
Medical supply warehouse	1,600
Total	37,650
Fort Bliss, TX:	
Hardstand	11,000
Barracks modernization	5,500
Barracks modernization	10,000
Total	26,500
Fort Dix, NJ:	
Main library	1,850
Dining facilities modernization	330
Vehicle maintenance instruction facility	920
Automated field fire range	3,000
Total	6,100
Fort Gordon:	
Addition to data processing building	760
Modified record fire range	880
Applied instruction facility	5,800
Barracks with dining facility	23,000
Applied instruction facility	14,600
Operation building	1,000
Total	46,040
Fort Jackson, SC: Dining facilities modernization	6,600
Fort Knox, KY:	
Vehicular bridge	8,800
Dining facilities modernization	1,300
Tactical equipment shop	5,300
Company operations and supply	870
Total	16,270
Fort Leavenworth, KS:	
Health clinic	2,550

Location and project	*Thousands*
Dining facility modernizaton	4,350
Total	6,900
Fort Lee, VA:	
General instruction building	9,100
Automated record fire ranges	1,750
Applied instruction facility	1,200
Total	12,050
Fort Leonard Wood, MO:	
General instruction building	1,150
Do	2,800
Total	3,950
Fort McClellan, AL:	
Unaccompanied officer housing	3,550
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	23,000
Total	26,550
Fort Pickett, VA: Chemical decontamination training area	420
Fort Rucker, AL:	
Unaccompanied officer housing	5,900
Land acquisition	1,200
Total	7,100
Fort Sill, OK:	
Hospital upgrade and addition	29,000
Trainee barracks	23,000
Total	52,000
Fort Story, VA: Hardstand	1,950

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Belvoir, VA: Physical fitness training center	2,800
Fort Benning, GA: Recreation center	[1]2,000
Fort Bliss, TX:	
Child care center	[2]2,350
Physical fitness training center	2,200
Fort Knox, KY: Child care center	[2]4,500
Fort McClellan, AL: General instruction building	12,800
Fort Rucker, AL: General instruction building	2,350

All projects deferred without prejudice due to budget constraints unless otherwise noted.

[1] Review scope and cost.

[2] Deferred pending 3d party financing test.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

The commander of the Military District of Washington (MDW) commands the troop units in the immediate Washington, D.C. area and is responsible for the operation of the installations under his jurisdiction.

The committee approved $8,300,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Myer, VA: Administration facility	$8,300

U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

The U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) is responsible for integrated, systemized management of the Army's wholesale materiel activities. The wholesale activities responsibilities range from research through acquisition and distribution to disposal.

The committee approved $122,570,000 for 37 projects at the following 20 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD:	
Dining facilities modernization	$4,400
Lighting modifications	270
Total	4,670
Anniston Army Depot, AL:	
Ammunition container loading yard	750
Machine shop	3,150
Facility energy improvements	360
Vehicle repair facility	4,700
Total	8,960
Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX: Helicopter blade facility	4,400
Detroit Arsenal, MI: Window replacement	320
Dugway Proving Ground, UT:	
Munitions processing for assembly facility	2,150
Ammunition storage	1,350
Photo optics maintenance facility	1,550
Operations building	3,600
Total	8,650
Navajo Army Depot, AZ: Ammunition container loading yard	240
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ: Insulate steam lines	1,000
Pine Bluff Arsenal, AR: Close hazardous waste	19,000
Pueblo Army Depot Activity, CO: Ammunition container loading yard	200
Red River Army Depot, TX: Ammunition container loading yard	820
Redstone Arsenal, AL:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	13,600
Hangar missile test facility	5,300
Target and seeker measurement facility	2,250
Propulsion aging laboratory	3,100
Total	24,250
Rock Island Arsenal, IL: Modernize manufacturing facility—REARM	29,000
Sacramento Army Depot, CA: Optical facility	4,550
Savanna Army Depot, IL: Ammunition container loading yard	510
Seneca Army Depot, NY:	
Vapor barrier addition	590
Energy monitoring and control system	360

Location and project	*Thousands*
Ammunition container loading yard	460
Total	1,410
Sierra Army Depot, CA: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,600
Tooele Army Depot, UT:	
Health clinic	2,000
CAMDS laboratory	3,200
Storm windows	240
Ammunition container loading yard	550
Insulate dock doors	600
Building insulation	700
R&D Science and technology facility	4,200
Total	11,490
Umatilla Depot Activity, OR: Ammunition container loading yard	260
Yuma Proving Ground, AZ: Wall insulation	240

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, MA: Water pollution abatement	$770
Fort Wingate, NM: Ammunition container loading yard	490
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA: Ammunition truck loading and blocking	[1]1,550
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, MO: Industrial wastewater treatment	[2]19,000
New Cumberland Army Depot, PA: Eastern distribution center	[2]88,000
Redstone Arsenal, AL: Child care center	[3]1,500
Sierra Army Depot, CA: Ammunition container loading yard	[4]370

All projects deferred without prejudice due to budget constraints unless otherwise noted.

[1] Review scope and cost.
[2] Deferred for review of possible 3d party financing.
[3] Deferred pending 3d party financing test.
[4] Review requirement.

ARMY AMMUNITION PLANTS

Army ammunition plants are used to produce conventional ammunition in support of war reserve, consumption, and training requirements including support to the other Services and selected allies.

The committee approved $15,950,000 for 13 projects at the following 8 locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Holston Army Ammunition Plant, TN:	
Fire protection sprinkler systems	$320

Location and project	*Thousands*
Backup electric power	1,350
Total	1,670
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, IN: Convert shiphouses to explosive storage	210
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, IA: Storm drainage improvements—Yard L	810
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS: Rehabilitate raw water intake	570
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, MO: Enclose warehouse loading docks	930
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, LA:	
Replace explosion protection barricade	370
Herbicide and pesticide building	270
Total	640
Newport Army Ammunition Plant, IN: Binary component production facility	[1] 8,000

[1] Revised Army cost estimate.

Radford Army Ammunition Plant, VA:	
Replace explosion protection barricades	2,000
Replace air compressor—Building 433	390
Alter building for nitrocellulose weighing	520
Total	2,910
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, KS: Guanidine nitrate shipout facility	210

U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND

The U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) is responsible for performing intelligence functions in support of Army field commanders and in fulfillment and support of those national intelligence responsibilities assigned to the Army.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Vint Hill Farm Station, VA:	
Warehouse addition	[1] $900
Equipment testing and evaluation facility	[2] 5,900

[1] Review scope and cost.

[2] Deferred without projudice.

U.S. ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

The U.S. Army Information Systems Command (USAISC) has world-wide responsibilities for engineering, installing, operating, and maintaining Army's information systems, the Army portion of the defense communications system, and for providing, operating, and maintaining the Army's communications-electronic facilities.

The committee approved $2,050,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Huachuca, AZ: Operations building	$2,050

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Huachuca, AZ: Automated record fire range	[1] $730

[1] Review scope and cost.

U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The U.S. Military Academy is responsible for instructing and training the corps of cadets in academic studies which are designed to lead the members to becoming commissioned officers of the Regular Army.

The committee approved $31,000,000 for six projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
U.S. Military Academy, NY:	
Chemistry laboratory modernization	$1,400
General instruction building	7,300
Expand academic facility	5,300
Energy monitoring system expansion	5,900
Modified record fire range	2,500
Boiler conversion	8,600
Total	31,000

U.S. ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Health Services Command (HSC) is responsible for providing Army health services to authorized recipients in the United States and its territories. It is the principal proponent and developer of concepts, doctrine, materiel requirements, and organizations for the health care system for the Army in field environments.

The committee approved $9,720,000 for three projects at the following three locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fort Detrick, MD: Operations building	$7,600
Tripler Army Medicine Center, HI: Alternate electric power source	970
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, DC: Energy monitoring and control system	1,150

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, CO: Physical fitness training center	[1] $2,550

[1] Deferred without prejudice due to budget constraints.

U.S. ARMY MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

The U.S. Army Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) is the Department of Defense single manager for traffic management, land transportation, and common user ocean terminals.

The committee approved $4,730,000 for four projects at the following three locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, NJ:	
Boiler and refrigeration plant automation	$1,000

Location and project	*Thousands*
Insulation and weatherstripping	2,200
Total	3,200
Oakland Army Base, CA: Rail head loading ramps	330
Sunnypoint Military Ocean Terminal, NC: Road and staging area paving.	1,200

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS COMMAND

The mission of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Command (USACE) is to exercise command and operation control of and provide support to assigned engineer divisions, districts, research and development organizations and designated field activities engaged in world-wide military construction and civil works programs.

The committee approved $11,000,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and projects	*Thousands*
Humphrey Engineering Center, VA: Topographic laboratory	$11,000

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Authorization for a special project was requested. The committee approved $3,000,000 for one project at an unspecified location.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

U.S. ARMY, JAPAN

The U.S. Army, Japan (USARJ) maintains bases in Japan to provide supply, maintenance, storage, procurement, transportation, engineering, medical and other essential services required to support USARJ operational plans with a capability for expansion when needed.

The committee approved $1,050,000 for one project at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Japan: Medical supply warehouse	$1,050

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY

The Eighth U.S. Army provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for U.S. Army units assigned to Korea.

The committee approved $146,080,000 for 64 projects in Korea at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Camp Carroll:	
Controlled humidity warehouses	$19,500
Field maintenance addition and paint shop	1,800
Satellite communications terminal building	2,600
Battalion headquarters	1,950
Hardstand	1,000
Medical supply warehouse	4,500
Medical supply operations building	980
Medical maintenance and optical shop	1,150
Calibration laboratory	1,600

Location and project	*Thousands*
Unaccompanied personnel housing	9,800
Total, Camp Carroll	40,380
Camp Casey:	
Dining facility	1,350
Company operations and supply	350
Tactical equipment shop	950
Dental clinic	2,350
Company operations and supply	370
Do	360
Canvas/tent repair facility	440
Warehouse	700
Unaccompanied personnel housing	3,600
Tactical equipment shop	2,450
Total, Camp Casey	12,920
Camp Castle: Unaccompanied enlisted personnal housing	1,100
Camp Colbern: Unaccompanied officer housing	550
Camp Edwards:	
Company operations and supply	360
Tactical equipment shop	730
Total, Camp Edwards	1,090
Camp Gary Owen: Unaccompanied officer housing	580
Camp Giant: Unaccompanied personnel housing	1,050
Camp Greaves: Moving target simulator building	420
Camp Hovey: Unaccompanied personnel housing	8,300
Camp Howze:	
Tactical equipment shop	800
Moving target simulator building	430
Tactical equipment shop	750
Total, Camp Howze	1,980
Camp Humphreys:	
Flight simulator building	1,850
25 meter firing range	700
Unaccompanied officer housing	3,700
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,450
Do	2,900
Total, Camp Humphreys	11,600
Camp Kittyhawk: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,600
Camp Kyle:	
Warehouses	2,650
Tactical equipment shop	930
Total, Camp Kyle	3,580
Camp Liberty Bell: Dining facility	800
Camp Market: Tactical equipment shop	710
Camp Page:	
Electrical distribution system upgrade	2,350
Fuel storage and dispensing facility	4,250
Dispensary/dental clinic	1,550
Airfield operations facilities	2,100

Location and project	*Thousands*
Tactical equipment shop	1,050
Central heating and cooling plant	4,550
Water and sewer upgrade	3,200
Aircraft maintenance hangar	7,200
Unaccompanied personnel housing	6,400
Total, Camp Page	32,650
Camp Pelham: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,400
Camp Red Cloud:	
Tactical equipment shop	1,400
Company operations and supply	330
Total Camp Red Cloud	1,730
Camp Stanley:	
Dispensary	1,150
Unaccompanied personnel housing	4,350
Total, Camp Stanley	5,500
K-16 Army Airfield:	
Flight simulator building	1,700
Tactical equipment shop	840
Paintshop	900
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	610
Total, K-16 Army Airfield	4,050
Location 177: Multipurpose activity center	740
Yongin: Unaccompanied personnel housing complex	2,550
Yongson:	
Warehouse addition	2,050
Chapel and religious education facility	2,150
Barracks and movement control center	2,150
Provost marshal command/control facility	1,450
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,000
Total, Yongson	9,800

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Camp Carroll: Medical supply warehouse	[1] $4,500
Location 177: Power upgrade	[1] 1,550

[1] Review scope and cost.

BALLISTICS MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The mission of the Ballistic Missile Defense Systems Command (BMDSC) is to coordinate and control all work and associated resources in testing and logistical support involved in developing effective ballistic missile defense systems.

The committee approved $14,600,000 for three projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Kwajalein:	
Shore erosion control	$2,400
Aircraft maintenance hangar	7,100
Upgrade airfield	5,100
Total	14,600

U.S. ARMY FORCES COMMAND

The U.S. Army Forces Command has command responsibility for the units, installations, and activities that are principally related to readiness and defense missions. It has command readiness responsibility for the bulk of the deployable troop units in the Army and is responsible for organizing, training, equipping, and insuring the combat readiness of assigned troop units.

The committee approved $7,680,000 for three projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Panama:	
Barracks modernization	$4,550
HVAC systems modifications	930
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,200
Total	7,680

U.S. ARMY EUROPE

The U.S. Army, Europe, provides administrative, medical, and logistical support for the U.S. Army, Europe, and the Seventh Army.

The committee approved $318,760,000 for 92 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Amberg, Germany: Ammunition storage	$850
Ansbach, Germany:	
Tactical site facilities	690
Dispensary/dental clinic	1,900
Tactical equipment shop	9,400
Dining facilities modernization	2,400
Total, Ansbach	14,390
Bad Kreuznach, Germany: Child care center	1,100
Bad Toelz, Germany: Dispensary/dental clinic	1,850
Bamberg, Germany:	
Boiler plant automation	6,000
Hardstand and equipment storage	490
Total, Bamberg	6,490
Baumholder, Germany: Child care center	900
Darmstadt, Germany:	
Ammunition storage phase I	600
Tactical equipment shop	4,400
Do	3,650
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,750
Battalion headquarters	1,700
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,500
Dining facility	1,300
Tactical equipment shop	8,300
Total, Darmstadt	29,200
Frankfurt, Germany:	
Battalion headquarters	990
Tactical equipment shop	3,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,850
Utilities modernization	5,200

Location and project	*Thousands*
Physical fitness training center	1,850
Battalion headquarters	990
Tactical equipment shop	2,300
Total, Frankfurt	18,680
Friedberg, Germany:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,200
Battalion headquarters	950
Total, Friedberg	9,150
Fulda, Germany:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,950
Community center	2,250
Total, Fulda	7,200
Giessen, Germany: Physical fitness training center	1,700
Goeppingen, Germany:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,850
Tactical equipment shop	3,800
Unaccompanied officer housing	2,500
Child care center	1,100
Total, Goeppingen	10,250
Grafenwoehr, Germany: Automated record fire range	2,450
Haingruen, Germany: Troop ready building	680
Hanau, Germany:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,600
Tactical equipment shop	4,050
Do	8,200
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,650
Tactical equipment shop	3,350
Dispensary/dental clinic	1,850
Child care center	780
Hardstand	1,850
Tactical equipment shop	21,000
Battalion headquarters	810
Total, Hanau	48,140
Heidelberg, Germany:	
Child care center	3,550
Tactical equipment shop	3,450
Operations building	1,800
Total, Heidelberg	8,800
Heilbronn, Germany:	
Hardstand	2,200
Do	750
Total, Heilbronn	2,950
Hohenfels, Germany:	
Military operations on urbanized terrain	3,250
Applied instruction facility	1,600

Location and project	*Thousands*
Automated record fire range	1,450
Total, Hohenfels	6,300
Kaiserslautern, Germany: Tactical equipment shop	3,450
Karlsruhe, Germany:	
Battery shop	2,000
Child care center	470
Tactical equipment shop	1,550
Total, Karlsruhe	4,020
Mainz, Germany: Ammunition storage	820
Neu Ulm, Germany: Child care center	1,000
Nurenberg, Germany:	
Ammunition storage	860
Tactical equipment shop	1,500
Battalion headquarters	2,300
Modified record fire range	2,850
Child care center	1,850
Total, Nurenberg	9,360
Pirmasens, Germany: Electronics maintenance facility	14,000
Schoeningen, Germany: Power distribution upgrade	700
Schweinfurt, Germany:	
Rotary wing aircraft parking	690
Ammunition storage	3,050
Barracks with dining facility	13,000
Battalion headquarters	1,100
Total, Schweinfurt	17,840
Stuttgart, Germany:	
Communications security support facility	1,050
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,450
Total, Stuttgart	4,500
Vilseck, Germany:	
Tactical equipment shop	3,850
Community center	3,200
Child care center	2,350
Headquarters	890
Total, Vilseck	10,290
Wiesbaden, Germany: Flight simulator building	2,900
Wildflecken, Germany: Multipurpose training ranges	20,000
Wuerzburg, Germany:	
Hospital upgrade and addition	31,000
Consolidate heating plants	5,600
Tactical site facilities	320
Ammunition storage	650
Sewer system upgrade	3,050
Hardstand	1,250
Child care center	2,050
Battalion headquarters	1,500

Location and project	*Thousands*
Dining facility	2,650
Total, Wuerzburg	48,070
Greece:	
Upgrade operations and supply building	800
Upgrade multipurpose building	640
Total, Greece	1,440
Italy:	
Child care center	1,350
Veterinary facility	500
Total, Italy	1,850
Turkey:	
Power upgrade	5,200
Solid waste incinerator	540
Warehouse	550
Unaccompanied officer housing	1,150
Total, Turkey	7,440

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The minor construction request is for unspecified projects having a funded cost of $1,000,000 or less, including construction, alteration, or conversion of permanent or temporary facilities. An amount of $31,000,000 has been designated for unspecified locations.

PROJECTS COSTING $1,000,000 OR LESS

Projects at specific locations costing $1,000,000 or less have been included in the station totals in this year's bill.

SUMMARY OF ARMY PROGRAM ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken on the request of the Army is tabulated by project as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Army request	2,023,910
U.S. Army Forces Command:	
Fort Bragg, NC:	
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	-2,950
Physical fitness training center	-2,000
Fort Campbell, KY:	
Radiant heaters	-430
Physical fitness training center	-5,900
Fort Carson, CO:	
Child care center	-2,600
Physical fitness training center	-4,100
Fort Devens, MA: NBC defense instruction facility	-610
Fort Drum, NY:	
Fire station	-990
Child care center	-2,000
Fort Greely, AK: Child care center	-2,500
Fort Hood, TX: Tactical equipment shop	-7,700
Fort Irwin, CA:	
Community center	-1,900

Location and project	*Cost*
Child care center	−1,450
Fort Lewis, WA:	
Barracks with dining facility	−4,850
Barracks with dining facility, new Army estimate reduction	−2,600
Child care center	−7,800
Fort Polk, LA:	
Tactical equipment shop	−11,200
Physical fitness training center	−7,000
Fort Riley, KS: Tactical equipment shop	−9,500
Fort Stewart, GA: Tactical equipment shop	−6,100
U.S Army Training and Doctrine Command:	
Fort Belvoir, VA: Physical fitness training center	−2,800
Fort Benning GA: Recreation center	−2,000
Fort Bliss, TX:	
Child care center	−2,350
Physical fitness training center	−2,200
Fort Knox, KY: Child care center	−4,500
Fort McClellan, AL: General instruction building	−12,800
Fort Rucker, AL: General instruction building	−2,350
U.S. Army Materiel Command:	
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, MA: Water pollution abatement	−770
Fort Wingate, NM: Ammunition container loading yard	−490
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA: Industrial wastewater treatment	−1,550
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, MO: Industrial wastewater treatment	−19,000
New Cumberland Army Depot, PA: Eastern distribution center	−88,000
Redstone Arsenal, AL: Child care center	−1,500
Sierra Army Depot, CA: Ammunition container loading yard	−370
Army Ammunition Plants: Newport Army Ammunition Plant, IN: Binary component production facility, New Army estimate reduction	−31,000
U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command:	
Vint Hill Farm Station, VA: Warehouse addition	−950
Equipment testing and evaluation facility	−5,900
U.S. Army Information Systems Command: Fort Huachuca, AZ: Automated record fire range	−730
U.S. Army Health Services Command: Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, CO: Physical fitness training center	−2,550
Eighth U.S. Army:	
Camp Carroll, Korea: Medical supply warehouse	−4,500
Location 177, Korea: Power upgrade	−1,550
Increase in planning and design	+12,600
Subtotal of actions	−259,440
Total, military construction for authorization	1,764,470
Less:	
Military construction reduction for prior year savings	−56,000
Military construction general reduction for favorable currency rates in Europe and the Pacific:	
Korea	−7,000
Europe	−23,000
Total military construction authorization for appropriation	1,678,470

FAMILY HOUSING

The Army presented an authorization request for appropriations for the Army Family Housing program as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Army request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (2,421 units requested)	171,031	103,060
Post acquisition construction	166,000	166,000
Planning and design	19,020	19,020
Total, construction	356,051	288,080
Operation and maintenance (156,874 units):		
Operating expenses	515,255	516,255
Maintenance	605,895	605,895
Total, operation and maintenance	1,121,150	1,122,150
Leasing:		
Foreign (20,070 units)	132,047	132,047
Domestic (2,404 units)	1,520	1,520
Total, leasing	133,567	133,567
Debt payment:		
Principal	15,064	15,064
Investment and other expenses	918	918
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	95	95
Total debt payment	16,077	16,077
Total Army family housing request	1,626,845	1,559,874
Less: Appropriation not required		−1,081
Total authorized for appropriations, Army family housing		1,558,793

The Army Family Housing program authorization for appropriations request totaled $1,626,845,000. The total request of $1,626,845,000 compares with $1,425,454,000 for fiscal year 1985.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $103,060,000 for 1,600 units of new construction at the following locations:

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Location	Units	Cost
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah	104	$8,323
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah (mobile home spaces)	24	351
Fort Myer, VA	6	596
Fort Ord, CA	600	49,559
Fort Ord. CA (mobile home spaces)	70	1,081
Fort Bragg, NC (mobile home spaces)	50	637
Fort Bragg, NC (conversions)	2	0
Fort Campbell, KY (mobile home spaces)	50	689
Fort Carson, CO (mobile home spaces)	50	712
Fort Riley, KS (mobile home spaces)	50	700
Fort Stewart, GA (mobile home spaces)	20	253
Bamberg, Germany	106	7,209
Vilseck, Germany	370	26,830
Various locations, Germany (conversions)	98	6,120

The committee did not authorize the following projects due to budget constraints:

Location	Units	Thousands
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts	1	$154
Fort Drum, NY	800	67,500
Fort Devens, MA (mobile home spaces)	20	317

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $166,000,000 for improvements to existing family housing units at installations inside the United States; installations in Japan; installations in Panama; installations in Korea; and communities in Germany as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Program	*Cost*
Regular improvements	155,050
Energy conservation investment	10,950

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved $19,020,000 for architectural and engineering service and construction design. These funds will be used to plan for and design future year projects as well as complete the design of fiscal year 1986 projects in new construction, improvements and energy conservation. Accordingly, the committee approved the amount requested.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $1,122,150,000 for operation and maintenance of the fiscal year 1986 estimated average inventory of 156,874 family housing units. Reimbursements are anticipated to be $13,800,000.

LEASING

The committee approved $132,047,000 for foreign leasing. The committee is aware of the Army requirement to remedy its housing shortfalls in foreign countries through a program of both new construction and foreign leasing dependent upon which is the more economical to accomplish.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved $16,077,000 for principal and interest payment on mortgaged Capehart and Wherry housing units and Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance premiums.

Summary of family housing actions

Total request	$1,626,845
Increase operations	+1,000
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, MA: New construction	−154
Fort Drum, NY: New construction	−67,500

Fort Devens, MA: New construction (mobile home spaces)	−317
Subtotal of actions	−66,971
Total, family housing authorization	1,559,874
Less: Appropriation not required	−1,081
Total, family housing authorization for appropriation	1,558,793

TITLE II—NAVY

The Navy requested authorization of $2,897,949,000. The committee after careful review and consideration of the Navy request, approved for the following programs:

	Navy request	Committee approved
Military construction:		
Inside the United States	$1,752,130,000	$1,445,135,000
Outside the United States	243,300,000	221,195,000
Design	139,260,000	143,260,000
Minor construction	21,560,000	21,560,000
Access roads	2,960,000	2,960,000
General reduction for bid savings	0	−50,000,000
Total, MILCON authorized	2,159,210,000	1,784,110,000
Military family housing:		
Construction, improvements, and design	154,000,000	154,000,000
Support	584,739,000	587,839,000
Total, family housing	738,739,000	741,839,000
Grand total, Navy	2,897,949,000	2,525,949,000

The Navy's authorization request for Military Construction and Family Housing Programs and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
U.S. Marine Corps	391,490	234,230
Chief of Naval Research	28,900	28,900
Office of the Comptroller of the Navy	2,940	2,940
Chief of Naval Operations	73,890	30,090
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet	149,515	129,635
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet	176,425	173,170
Chief of Naval Education and Training	162,215	138,985
Naval Military Personnel Command	1,900	1,900
Naval Medical Command	67,760	67,760
Chief of Naval Material	685,380	625,810
Naval Oceanography Command	4,890	4,890
Naval Telecommunications Command	785	785
Naval Security Group Command	6,040	6,040
Subtotal, inside the United States	1,752,130	1,445,135
Outside the United States:		
U.S. Marine Corps	7,015	7,015
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet	69,100	69,100
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet	100,710	100,710
Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe	22,795	22,795

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Navy request	Committee approved
Chief of Naval Material	5,480	5,480
Naval Telecommunications Command	33,520	11,415
Naval Security Group Command	3,700	3,700
Host Nation Infrastructure Support	980	980
Subtotal, outside the United States	243,300	221,195
Total	1,995,430	1,666,330
Unspecified minor construction	21,560	21,560
Architectural and engineering services and construction design	139,260	143,260
Access roads	2,960	2,960
General reduction	0	−50,000
Total	2,159,210	1,784,110
Family housing	738,739	741,839
Grand total	2,897,949	2,525,949

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Description	Request			Committee approved		
	Navy	Marine Corps	Total	Navy	Marine Corps	Total
Operational	233,567	31,080	264,647	212,077	31,080	243,157
Training	211,535	15,165	226,700	171,345	15,165	186,510
Maintenance and production	444,740	80,625	525,365	402,900	80,625	483,525
RDT&E	74,565	0	74,565	70,345	0	70,345
Supply	66,683	15,920	82,603	66,683	15,920	82,603
Medical	84,360	0	84,360	84,360	0	84,360
Administrative	83,910	14,060	97,970	46,080	14,060	60,140
Troop housing	165,630	70,960	236,590	155,030	70,960	225,990
Community	31,750	11,890	43,640	16,860	2,630	19,490
Utilities	99,840	153,785	253,625	99,060	5,785	104,845
Energy conservation	4,360	0	4,360	4,360	0	4,360
Water pollution abatement	16,610	5,020	21,630	16,610	5,020	21,630
Real estate	78,395	0	78,395	78,395	0	78,395
Subtotal	1,595,945	398,505	1,994,450	1,424,105	241,245	1,665,350
Access roads			2,960			2,960
Unspecified minor			21,560			21,560
Architectural and engineering services and construction design			139,260			143,260
NATO			980			980
Subtotal			2,159,210			1,834,110
General reduction						−50,000
Total			2,159,210			1,784,110

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $21,630,000 for 10 pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $4,360,000 for six energy conservation projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Marine Corps is responsible for providing air and ground forces for the seizure and defense of advanced naval bases and the conduct of land operations incident to the prosecution of the naval campaign.

The committee approved $234,230,000 for 67 projects at the following 16 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
MCLB, Barstow, CA: Radiographic facility	530
MCAS, Beaufort, SC:	
Aircraft parking apron	570
Ordnance handling pad	4,150
Fuel pier extension	685
Air combat training facility	1,080
Hazardous waste facility	420
Total	6,905
MCMWTC, Bridgeport, CA: Automotive maintenance shop	1,470
MCCD, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, VA:	
Combat vehicle maintenance facility	715
Fleet marine force support warehouse	3,280
Total	3,995
MCB, Camp Lejeune, NC:	
Vehicle mechanics training building	2,550
Combat vehicle maintenance shop	2,740
Light armored vehicle maintenance shop	4,850
Electronics and communications maintenance shop	3,280
Bachelor enlisted quarters	9,500
Sewerage system improvements	1,220
Total	24,140
MCB, Camp Pendleton, CA:	
Communications and electronics maintenance and storage facility	1,470
Communication improvements	6,000
Special intelligence support facility	1,520
Battalion headquarters	3,300
Bachelor enlisted quarters	7,950
Oil spill prevention	1,470
Armory addition	365
Tactical vehicle maintenance facility	3,100
Total	25,175
MCAF, Camp Pendleton, CA:	
Armory	570
Maintenance hangar	11,000
Automotive maintenance shop	1,270

Location and project	*Cost*
Group headquarters building	1,470
Total	14,310
MCAS, Cherry Point, NC:	
Vertical take-off and landing pads	4,600
Maintenance hangar modifications	3,190
Parachute and survival equipment shop addition	490
Operations, training and maintenance facilities	3,970
Aviation supply warehouse	5,100
Bachelor enlisted quarters	19,100
Total	36,450
MCAS, El Toro, CA:	
Tactical support van pads	2,250
Aircraft direct fueling facilities	4,460
Communications conduit	980
Aircrew water survival training facility	1,960
Electronics and communications maintenance facilities	1,470
Bachelor enlisted quarters	17,640
Loading and unloading ramps	345
Hazardous waste facility and oil spill prevention	1,270
Total	30,375
MCAS, Kaneohe Bay, HI:	
Maintenance hangar improvements	940
Heavy gun shop	4,900
Ground support equipment facilities	1,290
Aviation supply facilities	1,760
Medical warehouse	4,310
Electrical distribution system improvements	4,220
Total	17,420
MCAS, New River, NC:	
Aviation ready fuel storage	2,000
Ground support equipment facility	1,130
Helicopter maintenance hangar	7,650
Total	10,780
MCRD, Parris Island, SC:	
Clothing issue building	2,630
Recruit training building	980
Total	3,610
MCAS, Tustin, CA:	
Aircraft parking apron	4,450
Helicopter maintenance training building	2,250
Maintenance hangar	8,330
Helicopter engine maintenance shop	2,940
Total	17,970
MCAGCC, Twentynine Palms, CA:	
Battalion and battery headquarters	2,840
Brigade headquarters	2,880
Bachelor enlisted quarters	11,570
Total	17,290
MCDEV&EDCOM, Quantico, VA:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	5,200

Location and project	*Cost*
Sewerage system	1,860
Total	7,060
MCAS, Yuma, AZ:	
Attack aircraft training building	3,150
Operational trainer facility	2,550
Maintenance hangar	4,300
Engine test cell	3,570
Power check pads	1,130
Battalion headquarters	2,050
Total	16,750

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
MCAS, Beaufort, SC: Child care center	[1] 900
MCB, Camp Pendleton. CA: Santa Margarita water project	[2] 148,000
MCAS, Cherry Point, NC: Child care center	[1] 1,490
MCAGCC, Twentynine Palms, CA: Child care center	[1] 1,490
Physical fitness center	[3] 5,380

[1] Pending third party test.
[2] Scope not resolved.
[3] Budget constraints.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

The Chief of Naval Research is responsible for naval research related to the maintenance of future naval power and the preservation of the national security.

The committee approved $28,900,000 for a project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NRL, Washington, DC: Electronic warfare laboratory	28,900

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

The mission of the Office of the Comptroller of the Navy is to formulate principles and policies, and prescribes procedures and systems which will exercise effective control over the financial operations of the Department of the Navy through the application of sound accounting principles and progressive modernization of the programming, budgeting and financial management system development, financial analysis and auditing practices of the Department of the Navy.

The committee approved $2,940,000 for one project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NFC, Cleveland, OH: Data processing center addition	2,940

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

The Chief of Naval Operations is responsible for certain central executive organizations, assigned shore activities, and the operating forces of the Navy.

The committee approved $30,090,000 for eight projects at the following eight locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NA, Annapolis, MD: Public works shops and storage	1,880
NAVSPACECOM, Dahlgren, VA: Command and control center	4,700
NARDAC, Jacksonville, FL: Data processing center	10,300
NSPSUFLDSTA, Lewisville, AR: Antenna modernization and land acquisition	675
NTISA, Mayport, FL: Tactical data system facility	470
NTISA, North Island, CA: Headquarters building	585
NARDAC, Norfolk, VA: Data processing center	10,880
NAVSPSURFLDSTA, San Diego, CA: Antenna modernization	600

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NA, Annapolis, MD: Brigade activities center	[1] 21,600
NPGS, Monterey, CA: Ocean sciences academic building	[2] 13,000
INTELCENPAC, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, HI: Intelligence center addition	[3] 2,900
COMNAVDIST, Washington, DC: Administrative office modernization	[4] 6,300

[1] Reduce scope.

[2] Consider lesser cost alternative.

[3] Budget constraints.

[4] Not justified.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, is responsible for air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations within the Atlantic region.

The committee approved $129,635,000 for 26 projects at the following 10 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAS, Brunswick, ME: Patrol aircraft maintenance training building	3,040
NAS, Cecil Field, FL:	
Aircraft parking apron	2,800
Training range debriefing facility	785
Air combat training range and land acquisition	26,250
Total	29,835
NS, Charleston, SC:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters	9,600
Storm sewer	360
Total	9,960
NAS, Jacksonville, FL:	
Antisubmarine warfare aircraft training buildings	5,800
Brig	6,470
Total	12,270
NAVPHIBSE, Little Creek, VA:	
Combat swimmer training facility	4,070
Explosive ordnance disposal group complex	4,560

Location and project	*Cost*
Bachelor enlisted quarters	7,740
Total	16,370
NS, Mayport, FL:	
Fleet training support facility	810
Fire and rescue station addition	210
Helicopter maintenance hangar	9,800
Total	10,820
NSB, New London, CT: Submarine magnetic silencing facility	365
NS, New York, NY:	
Site improvements	3,920
Land acquisition	2,940
Dredging	11,700
Total	18,560
NAS, Norfolk, VA:	
Mine countermeasures helicopter training building	1,130
Warning aircraft training building addition	815
Helicopter Maintenance hangar	7,160
Oil spill prevention	1,570
Total	10,675
NS, Norfolk, VA: Dredging	800
NAS, Oceana, VA:	
Maintenance hangar	11,000
Steam and condensate systems	840
Land acquisition	5,100
Total	16,940

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Mayport, FL: Child care center	[1] 2,240
NF, Radio Island, NC:	
Equipment washdown facility and land acquisition	[2] 17,640

[1] Pending third party test.

[2] Consider lesser cost alternatives.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

The Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet is responsible for air, surface, submarine and fleet marine forces and supporting shore installations within the Pacific region.

The committee approved $173,170,000 for 27 projects at the following 16 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NF, Adak, AK: Electric power plant	2,650
NAS, Alameda, CA: Dredging	8,650
NSB, Bangor, WA: Bachelor enlisted quarters	5,200
PHIBTASKFORCE, Camp Pendleton, CA: Landing craft air cushion complex	9,020
NAVPHIBSE, Coronado, CA:	
Waterfront operations building	3,050
Amphibious forces training building	3,500

Location and project	*Cost*
Sealift support maintenance facility	4,400
Bachelor enlisted quarters	5,200
Total	16,150
NS, Everett, WA: Land acquisition	17,640
NAS, Fallon, NV:	
Strike warfare training building	7,350
Aircraft parking apron	8,230
Range improvements	12,000
Control tower	2,350
Utility systems improvements	6,570
Total	36,500
NAS, Lemoore, CA: Helicopter escape trainer	21,300
NS, Long Beach, CA: Bachelor enlisted quarters	16,000
NAS, Miramar, CA: Hazardous waste facility	385
NAS, North Island, CA:	
Helicopter maintenance hangar	13,130
Ordnance facilities	5,463
Total	18,593
NSB, Pearl Harbor, HI:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	2,900
NS, San Diego, CA:	
Deperming pier	9,110
Degaussing building	980
Dredging	6,107
Total	16,197
NSB, San Diego, CA: Electrical distribution system improvements	14,120
NS, Seattle, WA: Brig	3,480
NS, Mare Island, Vallejo, CA: Telephone lines	735
NAS, Whidbey Island, WA: Maintenance hanger improvements	2,650

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NS, Long Beach, CA: Construction battalion unit complex	[1]1,230
COMOCSYSPAC, Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval ocean processing facility addition	[2]1,180
NS, San Diego, CA: Child care center	[3]845

[1] Not justified.
[2] Budget constraints.
[3] Pending third party test.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

The Chief of Naval Education and Training is responsible for the education and training of all naval personnel.

The committee approved $138,985,000 for 34 projects at the following 22 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
FMWTC, Charleston, SC: Mine warefare training facility	1,180
NAVPHISCH, Coronado, CA.	
Landing craft air cushion training building	5,900

Location and project	*Cost*
Combat swimmer trainer facility	3,430
Total	9,330
SWOSCOLCOMDET, Coronado, CA: Surface warfare officer training building	5,200
NAS, Corpus Christi, TX:	
Land acquisition	1,960
Electrical switching station	2,400
Total	4,360
FCTCLANT, Dam Neck, VA: Radarman training building	7,150
NAVEODSCOL, Eglin, FL: Explosive ordnance disposal training facilities	13,700
NAVCONSTRACEN, Gulfport, MS: Seabee training buildings	2,460
NAVPHIBSCOL, Little Creek, VA: Amphibious force training building improvements	420
NAS, Memphis, TN:	
Radar operational facility	835
Aviation mechanics training buildings	6,750
Air traffic controller training building	2,740
Naval legal service building	1,370
Brig	3,180
Total	14,875
NAS Meridian, MS: Road improvement	450
NAVSUBSCH, New London, CT: Submarine training building	13,300
NETC, Newport: RI:	
Bachelor officer quarters	8,700
Construction battalion unit complex	1,180
Fire fighting training facility	8,800
Facility energy improvements	1,570
Senior enlisted academy	3,430
Municipal newer connection	4,600
Total	28,280
NTC, Orlando, FL: Barracks	9,400
NAS, Pensacola. FL: Facility energy improvements	225
NTTC, Pensacola, FL:	
Crypto training building	1,370
Bachelor enlisted quarters improvements	4,300
Total	5,670
NAVCONSTRAC, Port Hueneme, CA: Seabee training buildings	4,800
FASWTCPAC, San Diego, CA: Antisubmarine warfare training building	7,850
FCTCPAC, San Diego, CA: LAMPS MK III training building	305
FTC, San Diego, CA: Damage control training facility	4,750
NTC, San Diego, CA: Patternmaker training building	2,900
NTTC, San Francisco, CA: Underway replenishment training building	1,570
NAS, Whiting Field, FL: Pay and personnel support office	810

The committee did not authorize the following projects;

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
FCTCLANT, Dam Neck, VA: Chapel and religious education building	[1]2,490
NTC, Great Lakes, IL:	
Diesel engineman training facility addition	[1]4,360
Barracks	[1]10,600
Physical fitness center	[1]5,780

[1] Budget constraints.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

The Naval Military Personnel Command is responsible for the procurement, distribution, administration and motivation of the military personnel of the Regular and Reserve components of the Navy; and for the management and administration of the Navy's civilian personnel; and for the development of service wide programs for improvement of human resources management.

The committee approved $1,900,000 for a project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVBAND, Washington, DC: Navy band training building modernization	1,900

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

The Naval Medical Command is responsible for the health of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, their dependents, and other personnel.

The committee approved $67,760,000 for seven projects at the following seven locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVMEDCLIN, Annapolis, MD: Naval hospital	12,540
NH, Groton, CT: Hospital expansion	8,720
NH, Jacksonville, FL: Hospital addition	18,600
NH, Long Beach, CA: Medical clinic	6,300
NH, Oak Harbor, WA: Hospital addition	13,900
NH, Pensacola, FL: Medical and dental clinic	7,250
NH, San Diego, CA: Fire station	450

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

The Navy Material Command is the single integrated material support agency for the Navy. It is responsible for the development, procurement and support of total weapons systems, depot maintenance, supply management and facilities support.

The committee approved $625,810,000 for 68 projects at the following 32 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Puget Sound NSY, Bremerton, WA:	
Inactive submarine mooring	620
Underwater equipment laboratory addition	960
Electrical distribution system improvements and land acquisition	20,650
Waterfront security lighting	765
Municipal sewer connection	7,950
Total	30,945
NSC, Bremerton, WA: POL storage facilities	1,520
NWS, Charleston, SC: Ammuniton overhaul shop	3,230
Total	3,230
POMFLANT, Charleston, SC: Fire protection water tank	1,620

Location and project	*Cost*
NARF, Cherry Point, NC: Hazardous and flammable storage facility	1,720
NWC, China Lake, CA:	
Pay and personnel support office	785
Fixed point test facility	1,670
Ordnance research laboratory	6,860
Total	9,315
NWS, Earle, NJ:	
Mine assembly facility	780
Weapons handling facility	2,940
Total	3,720
NCBC, Gulfport, MS: Seabee equipment maintenance facility	2,550
NOS, Indian Head, MD: Bachelor officer quarters modernization	1,570
NSC, Jacksonville, FL:	
Waterfront transit shed	285
Fuel truck loading facility	1,270
Total	1,555
NUSWES, Keyport, WA:	
Torpedo assembly building	660
Hazardous and flammable storehouse	1,780
Total	2,440
NSB, Kings Bay, GA:	
Communications antenna facilities	1,670
Tender mooring and lay berths	23,500
Dredging	23,380
Explosives handling wharf	39,010
Strategic weapons facility (Phase II)	91,360
Drydock	125,600
Command and control systems shop	7,160
Controlled industrial facility	7,550
Hull shops	12,740
Refit warehouse	7,920
Strategic weapons magazines	13,700
Consolidated personnel support facility	3,230
Bachelor enlisted quarters and administrative facility	5,400
Community impact assistance	6,140
Utilities and site improvements	35,700
Total	404,060
NAEC, Lakehurst, NJ: Energy monitoring and control system	600
Long Beach NSY, Long Beach, CA: Sonar rubber dome facility	7,160
NOS, Louisville, KY:	
Gun shop and land acquisition	4,210
Plating shop modernization	12,740
Total	16,950
NARF, Norfolk, VA:	
Heavy processes shops	11,170
Hazardous and flammable storage facility	1,910
Total	13,080
NSC, Norfolk, VA: Warehouse modernization	2,350
NARF, North Island, CA:	
Engineering laboratory	9,120

Location and project	*Cost*
Heating, ventilation, air conditioning	345
Total	9,465
NSC, Oakland, CA:	
Dredging	6,570
Oil spill prevention	1,320
Total	7,890
Pearl Harbor NSY, Pearl Harbor, HI: Hazardous and flammable storage facility	1,860
NPWC, Pearl Harbor, HI: Electrical distribution system improvements	13,700
NPWC, Pensacola, FL: Electrical distribution system improvements	8,430
PMTC, Point Mugu, CA: Bachelor enlisted quarters	10,200
NCBC, Port Hueneme, CA:	
Seabee materiel transit facility	6,960
Seabee operations headquarters	5,880
Bachelor enlisted quarters	5,100
Cogeneration utility plant addition	3,630
Total	21,570
NSWSES, Port Hueneme, CA: Weapon systems engineering buildings	10,780
NESEC, Portsmouth, VA:	
Communications systems laboratory addition	825
Shipboard electronics support laboratory	880
Utilities improvements	1,550
Total	3,255
Norfolk NSY, Portsmouth, VA:	
Dockside work center addition	530
Mess hall	560
Bachelor officer quarters	5,600
Total	6,690
NSC, San Diego, CA:	
Fire protection system	1,760
Cold storage warehouse	5,340
Total	7,100
NAVELECSYSENGACT, St. Inigoes, MD:	
Command, control and communications laboratory	7,850
Utilities improvements	3,140
Combatant communications assembly and test facility	4,560
Total	15,550
Mare Island NSY, Vallejo, CA: Security lighting	815
NMINEWARENGACT, Yorktown, VA: Mine warfare systems laboratory.	4,120

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NARF, Alameda, CA:	
Paint and finishing hangar	[1] 24,200
Energy monitoring and control system	[2] 780
NWS, Charleston, DC: Gymnasium	[2] 840
NCBC, Port Hueneme, CA: Chapel and religious education building	[1] 2,080
NESEC, San Diego, CA: Fleet support center	[2] 27,450
NADC, Warminster, PA: Navigation equipment laboratory	[1] 4,220

[1] Budget constraints.

[2] Reconsider alternatives.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

The Naval Oceanography Command is responsible for providing research and operational data of the environment to support the Navy and other services. Data includes mapping, charting and geodesy publications.

The committee approved $4,890,000 for two projects at the following two locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVOCEACMDFAC, Jacksonville, FL: Meteorological building addition	390
NAVWESTOCEANCEN, Pearl Harbor, HI: Meteorological building	4,500

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

The Naval Telecommunications Command is responsible for providing communications by satellite and radio for administrative functions and command and control of Navy ships.

The committee approved $785,000 for a project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NRS, Sugar Grove, WV: Sewerage system	785

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

The Naval Security Group Command is responsible for signal intelligence, protection of U.S. Navy signals and other exploitable emissions, special communications systems, technical research and development for the creation of new systems and equipment and Navy-wide support of the Armed Forces Courier Service.

The committee approved $6,040,000 for six projects at the following four locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NSGA, Adak, AK: Security improvements	980
NSGA, Northwest, Chesapeake, VA:	
Strategic facilities and public works shop	835
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	550
Total	1,385
NSGA, Skaggs Island, CA: Computer support warehouse	395
NSGA, Winter Harbor, ME:	
Public works shop	880
Ocean surveillance building addition	2,400
Total	3,280

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

For the Marine Corps outside the United States, the committee approved $7,015,000 for five projects at the following three locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
MCAS, Iwakuni, JP:	
Operational trainer facility	645
Aviation armament shop	1,130
Total	1,775
MCAS Futenma, Okinawa, JP:	
Refueling vehicle shop	1,320
Ground support equipment shop addition	1,670
Total	2,990
MCB Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, JP: Heavy gun shop	2,250

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved $69,100,000 for 10 projects at the following 6 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
NF Argentina, NF, CAN: Fire protection system	700
NF, Antigua, W.I.: Naval facility upgrade	2,410
NS, Guantanamo Bay, CU:	
Bachelor enlisted quarters—new and moderization	10,060
Communication facilities	2,750
Bachelor officer quarters	9,600
Total	22,410
NS, Keflavik, IC:	
Airfield improvements	20,510
Aircraft acoustical enclosure support facilities	1,270
Total	21,780
LANTFLTWPNTRFAC, Roosevelt Roads, PR:	
Underwater range operations center	4,100
Range operations center	3,000
Total	7,100
NS, Roosevelt Roads, PR: Bachelor quarters	14,700

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

For the Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, outside the United States, the committee approved $100,710,000 for 17 projects at the following 9 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
NAS, Cubi Point, RP: Maintenance hangar	19,200
NSF, Diego Garcia, IO:	
Lighted navigational aids	510
Antenna support facilities	1,320
Fleet support warehouse	2,500
Laundry building addition	3,280

Location and project	*Cost*
Bachelor officer quarters	8,920
Total	16,530
NAF, Diego Garcia, IO:	
Fire station addition	980
Maintenance hangar	15,200
Weapons complex	6,270
Total	22,450
NM, Guam:	
Wharf utilities	6,570
Bachelor enlisted quarters and mess hall	4,700
Total	11,270
NSD, Guam: Cold storage warehouse addition	6,550
NS, Guam: Fleet hospital support facilities	10,200
NSRF, Guam: Sand storage silo	990
NM, Subic Bay, RP: Fire protection	250
NSRF, Subic Bay, RP:	
Shipfitting shops	4,070
Wharf electrical distribution system improvements	9,200
Total	13,270

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

The Commander in Chief, Naval Forces Europe, is responsible for the Naval component of the unified U.S. European Command. The committee approved $22,795,000 for seven projects at the following five locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVACTS, London, UK:	
Support building acquisition	785
Fleet hospital support facilities	6,850
Total	7,635
NSA, Naples, IT: Supply facilities	7,750
NS, Rota, SP: Fire alarm system	1,030
NAS, Sigonella, IT:	
Operations vehicle garage	2,250
Administrative and security facilities	3,680
Total	5,930
PERSUPACT, London, UK: Pay and personnel support office	450

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

The Chief of Naval Material is the single integrated material support agency for the Navy. It is responsible for the development, procurement and support of total weapons systems, depot maintenance, supply management and facilities support.

The committee approved $5,480,000 for two projects at the following two locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NPWC, Guam: Steam system improvements	1,080
NPWC, Yokosuka, JP: Electrical distribution system improvements	4,400

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

For the Naval Telecommunications Command, outside the United States, the committee approved $11,415,000 for four projects at the following three locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVCAMSWESTPAC, Guam: Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	8,330
NCS, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia:	
Small craft boathouse	390
Cooling systems conversion	2,300
Total	2,690
NCS, Rota, SP: Operational storage	395

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NAVCAMSWESTPAC, Guam: Child care center addition	[1] 615
NCS, Yokosuka, JP: Fleet operational control center	[2] 21,490

[1] Pending third party test.

[2] Seek JFIP funding.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

For the Naval Security Group Command, outside the United States, the committee approved $3,700,000 for a project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
NSGD, Diego Garcia, IO: Ocean surveillance building addition	3,700

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

The following projects are at various locations. The committee approved $163,780,000 for three projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Various:	
Access roads	2,960
Unspecified minor	21,560
Architectural and engineering	143,260

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Host Nation Infrastructure Support outside the United States will support NATO projects which the United States is host nation.

The committee approved $980,000 for a project at various locations.

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Various locations: Host nation infrastructure	980

SUMMARY OF NAVY PROGRAM ACTIONS

A summary of actions taken of the request of the Navy is tabulated by project as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Navy request	2,159,210
U.S. Marine Corps:	
MCAS, Beaufort, SC: Child care center	[1] −900
MCB, Camp Pendleton, CA: Santa Margarita water project	[2] −148,000
MCAS, Cherry Point, NC: Child care center.	[1] −1,490
MCAGCC, Twentynine Palms, CA:	
Child care center	[1] −1,490
Physical fitness center	[3] −5,380
Chief of Naval Operations:	
NA, Annapolis, MD: Brigade activities center	[4] −21,600
NPGS, Monterey, CA: Ocean sciences academic building	[5] −13,000
INTELECENPAC, Pearl Harbor, HI: Intelligence center addition	[3] −2,900
COMNAVDIST, Washington, DC: Administrative office modernization	[6] −6,300
Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet:	
NS, Mayport, FL: Child care center	[1] −2,240
NF, Radio Island, NC: Equipment washdown facility and land acquisition	[5] −17,640
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet:	
NS, Long Beach, CA: Construction battalion unit complex	[6] −1,230
COMOCSYSPAC, Pearl Harbor, HI: Naval ocean processing facility addition	[3] −1,180
NS, San Diego, CA: Child care center	[1] −845
Chief of Naval Education and Training:	
FCTCLANT, Dam Neck, VA: Chapel and religious education building	[3] −2,490
NTC, Great Lakes, IL:	
Diesel engineman training facility addition	[3] −4,360
Barracks	[3] −10,600
Physical fitness center	[3] −5,780
Chief of Naval Material:	
NARF, Alameda, CA:	
Paint and finishing hangar	[3] −24,200
Energy monitoring and control system	[3] −780
NWS, Charleston, SC: Gymnasium	[3] −840
NCBC, Port Hueneme, CA: Chapel and religious education building	[3] −2,080
NESEC, San Diego, CA: Fleet support center	[7] −27,450
NADC, Warminster, PA: Navigation equipment laboratory	[3] −4,220
Naval Telecommunications Command:	
NAVCAMWESTPAC, Guam: Child care center	[1] −615
NCS Yokosuka, JP: Fleet operational control center	[8] −21,490
Various locations:	
Architectural and engineering services and construction design	[9] +4,000
General reduction for bid savings	−50,000
Total military construction authorized for appropriation	1,784,110,000

[1] Pending third-party test.
[2] Scope not resolved.
[3] Budget constraints.
[4] Reduce scope.
[5] Consider lesser cost alternatives.
[6] Not justified
[7] Reconsider alternatives.
[8] Seek JFIP funding.
[9] Committee add.

FAMILY HOUSING

The Navy's request for the Family Housing Program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

NAVY FAMILY HOUSING

[In thousands of dollars]

Request	Request	Committee change	Revised total
Construction of new family housing (1,227 units)	113,050	0	113,050
Post acquisition construction	40,950	0	40,950
Construction improvements	(34,020)	0	(34,020)
Planning	(6,930)	0	(6,930)
Total authorization for appropriation request, construction	154,000	0	154,000
Operations and maintenance:			
Operating Expenses:			
Management account	(42,155)	[1] +3,100	(45,255)
Services account	(29,946)	0	(29,946)
Utilities account	(181,343)	0	(181,343)
Furnishing account	(13,636)	0	(13,636)
Miscellaneous account	(420)	0	(420)
Total operating expenses	267,500	[1] +3,100	270,600
Total maintenance account	277,458	0	277,458
Leasing	22,479	0	22,479
Domestic	(3,545)	0	(3,545)
Foreign	(18,934)	0	(18,934)
Debt payment	17,302	0	17,302
Principal	(16,239)	0	(16,239)
Interest payment family housing	(822)	0	(822)
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums for existing coverage	(241)	0	(241)
Total authorization request O&M and debt payment	584,739	[1] +3,100	587,839
Total authorization for appropriation request, Construction, O&M and debt payment	738,739	[1] 3,100	741,839

[1] Committee add.

The Navy Family Housing Program authorization for appropriations request totaled $741,839,000. In addition, $11,429,000 will be applied to the program from anticipated reimbursements.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved the construction or acquisition of 1,227 units of family housing in support of housing at the following locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
NAS, Adak, AK: 100 units	$15,500
MCAS El Toro, CA: 282 units	29,800
PWC, San Diego, CA: 200 units	15,200
MCAGCC, Twentynine Palms, CA: 100 units	8,400
FTGP, Warner Springs, CA: 44 units	4,400
NWS, Earle, NJ: 200 units	15,400

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	Cost
ASO, Philadelphia, PA: 1 unit	170
PWC, Subic Bay, RP: 300 units	24,180
Total: 1,227 units	113,050

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Location and project	*Cost*
Total request	738,739
Management account	[1] +3,100
Total family housing, authorization of appropriations	741,839

[1] Committee add.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

The Air Force requested authorization of $2,917,048,000. The committee, after careful review and consideration of the Air Force request, approved $2,637,088,000 for the following programs:

	Air Force request	Total authorization for appropriation	Less amounts not authorized for appropriation	Total authorized for appropriation
Military construction:				
Inside the United States	$1,265,517,000	$1,065,117,000	[1] −33,000,000	1,032,117,000
Outside the United States	511,497,000	483,737,000	[1] −17,000,000	466,737,000
Architectural and engineering services	144,096,000	144,096,000		144,096,000
Unspecified minor construction	22,000,000	22,000,000		22,000,000
Total military construction authorization	1,943,110,000	1,714,950,000	−50,000,000	1,664,950,000
Military family housing:				
Construction	214,400,000	212,600,000		212,600,000
Support	729,298,000	729,298,000		729,298,000
Total family housing	943,698,000	941,898,000		941,898,000
Subtotal Air Force	2,886,808,000	2,656,848,000	50,000,000	2,616,848,000
Defense access roads	30,240,000	30,240,000		30,240,000
Grand total, Air Force	2,917,048,000	2,687,088,000	−50,000,000	2,637,088,000

[1] Reduction for anticipated bid savings.

The Air Force's authorization request for the military construction program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Inside the United States:		
Air Force Logistics Command	186,148	171,748
Air Force Systems Command	68,760	49,410
Air Force Reserve	500	0
Air National Guard	12,370	12,370
Air Training Command	100,300	97,850
Air University	14,000	5,200
Alaskan Air Command	105,360	79,860
Military Airlift Command	167,540	149,830
Pacific Air Forces	5,530	3,330
Space Command	11,250	11,250
Special Project	55,000	55,000
Strategic Air Command	337,014	256,124
Tactical Air Command	191,435	162,835
U.S. Air Force Academy	10,310	10,310
Generaln reduction for bid savings		−33,000
Total, inside the United States	1,265,517	1,032,117

MAJOR COMMAND SUMMARY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Major command	Air Force request	Committee approved
Outside the United States:		
Military Airlift Command	38,885	28,785
Pacific Air Forces	133,280	129,930
Space Command	38,450	38,450
Tactical Air Command	23,172	23,172
U.S. Air Forces in Europe	277,710	263,400
General reduction for bid savings		−17,000
Total, outside the United States	511,497	466,737
Support:		
Unspecified minor construction	22,000	22,000
Architectural and engineering services	144,096	144,096
Total support	166,096	166,096
Total military construction	1,943,110	1,664,950
Total family housing	943,698	941,898
Subtotal, Air Force	2,886,808	2,616,848
Defense access roads	30,240	30,240
Grand total, Air Force	2,917,048	2,637,088

FACILITY CATEGORY SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

Facility category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Operational	459,964	423,944
Training	108,940	91,510
Maintenance/production	355,808	322,598
Research, development, test and evaluation	67,250	50,350
Supply	157,290	150,990
Medical	26,470	26,470
Administrative	107,380	57,930
Personnel housing/community support	281,170	252,520
Personnel housing	(217,210)	(209,610)
Community support	(63,960)	(42,910)
Utilities	182,150	141,950
Water pollution abatement	2,800	2,800
Energy	27,792	27,792
Minor construction	22,000	22,000
Architectural and engineering services	144,096	144,096
General reduction for bid savings		−50,000
Subtotal military construction	1,943,110	1,664,950
Military family housing	943,698	941,898
Subtotal Air Force	2,886,808	2,616,848
Defense access roads	30,240	30,240
Grand total Air Force	2,917,048	2,637,088

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

The committee approved $2,800,000 for pollution abatement projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The committee approved $27,722,000 for energy conservation investment projects. The projects are listed with the appropriate command's projects.

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

The Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) is responsible for providing an adequate and efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance and supply for the United States Air Force and training specialized units for accomplishment of logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters.

The committee approved $171,748,000 for 31 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Hill Air Force Base, UT:	
Add to and alter aircraft corrosion control facility	$13,400
Peacekeeper—transporter repair facility	8,300
Depot explosive storage complex	2,600
Facility energy improvements	3,980
Total	28,280
Kelly Air Force Base, TX:	
Hydrant fueling system	4,600
Approach lighting	1,450
Integration support facility	9,299
Depot machine shop	11,500
Add to and alter jet engine test cell complex	6,500
Dental clinic	2,800
Add to and alter visiting officer quarters	1,950
Emergency backup power	2,500
Alter electrical distribution system	1,100
Total	41,699
McClellan Air Force Base, CA:	
Aircraft accessory maintenance complex	16,929
Sound suppressor support	700
Depot electronic warfare/communications facility	13,100
Medical and occupational health clinic	12,800
Logistics systems operations center	10,300
Total	53,829
Robins Air Force Base, GA:	
Fire protection-avionics facilities	1,950
Large item storage facility	5,400
Total	7,350
Tinker Air Force Base, OK:	
Transient munitions facility/land acquisition	6,900
E-3A maintenance hangar	6,800
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	4,650

Location and project	*Thousands*
Alter petroleum operations facilities storage complex	3,650
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,100
Add to and alter heat plant	6,400
Total	31,500
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH:	
Add to and alter precision measurement equipment lab	920
Entomology shop	770
Add to and alter high power research lab	1,950
Alter electrical distribution system	1,500
Add to and alter storm drainage system	3,950
Total	9,090

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Tinker Air Force Base, OK: Add to and alter recreation center	[1] 1,600
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH: Add to and alter science engineering and support complex	[2] 12,800

[1] Budget constraints.
[2] Review scheduling alternatives.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) is responsible for advancing aerospace technology, adapting it to operational aerospace systems, and acquiring quantitatively superior aerospace systems and material needed to accomplish the Air Force mission.

The committee approved $49,410,000 for 10 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Brooks Air Force Base, TX: Vehicle maintenance shop	$2,500
Total	2,500
Edwards Air Force Base, CA:	
Alter physical science lab	2,450
Add to and alter flight test mission control center	4,800
Total	7,250
Eglin Air Force Base, FL:	
Mobility readiness facility	3,000
Sound suppressor support	960
Heavy metal weapons research and development facility	5,500
Sewage treatment plant	2,800
Total	12,260
Hanscom Air Force Base, MA:	
Systems management engineering facility	11,000
Alter central heat plant	13,700
Total	24,700
Sunnyvale Air Force Station, CA: Alter mission control complex	2,700
Total	2,700

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Arnold Engineering Development Center, TN: Engineering analysis facility	[1] $16,900

Location and project	*Thousands*
Hanscom Air Force Base, MA: Library and education center	[2] $2,450

[1] Review for lower cost alternative.
[2] Budget Constraints.

AIR RESERVE FORCES

The mission of the Air Force Reserves is to develop, maintain and provide the Active Air Force with those operationally ready units and trained individuals needed to augment the active force in time of war or national emergency.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Billy Mitchell Field, WI: Administrative facility	[1] $500

[1] Budget constraints.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard is responsible for providing units with trained personnel and sufficient and suitable equipment, capable and ready for mobilization in time of war or national emergency to support the Air Force.

The committee approved $12,370,000 for two projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Buckley Air National Guard Base, CO:	
Security police operations facility	$670
Aerospace date facility/utility distribution system	11,700
Total	12,370

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

The Air Training Command (ATC) is responsible for providing flying training leading to an aeronautical rating, aircrew training, basic and advanced technical training leading to an Air Force specialty, basic military training, mobile training, and other training as may be directed by the United States Air Force Chief of Staff.

The committee approved $97,850,000 for 21 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Chanute Air Force Base, IL:	
Add to and alter aircraft engine training facility	$1,400
Medical war reserve materiel facility	330
Total	1,730
Goodfellow Air Force Base, TX:	
Operations intelligence training facility	13,500
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	11,000
Dining hall	3,000
Total	27,500
Keesler Air Force Base, MS:	
Electronic assembly and checkout facility	2,100

Location and project	*Thousands*
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,400
Total	10,500
Lackland Air Force Base, TX:	
Satellite communications ground terminal	2,950
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	14,800
Dining hall	5,000
Total	22,750
Laughlin Air Force Base, TX: Water supply main/land acquisition	1,900
Total	1,900
Lowry Air Force Base, CO:	
Add to and alter academic classrooms	3,500
Cold storage facility	3,350
Total	6,850
Mather Air Force Base, CA:	
Central life support equipment facility	1,200
Accounting and finance facility	1,500
Total	2,700
Randolph Air Force Base, TX: Vehicle maintenance complex	3,200
Total	3,200
Reese Air Force Base, TX: Vehicle maintenance complex	3,250
Total	3,250
Sheppard Air Force Base, TX:	
Medical training facility	14,000
Medical logistics facility	2,150
Total	16,150
Vance Air Force Base, OK: Central life support equipment facility	660
Total	660
Williams Air Force Base, AZ: Add to and alter avionics shop	660
Total	660

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Goodfellow Air Force Base, TX: Recreation center	[1]2,450

[1] Budget constraints.

AIR UNIVERSITY

The Air University (AU) is responsible for Air Force professional military education. It also provides support for the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) and the Air Force Data System Design Center.

The committee approved $5,200,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL:	
Squadron officers school-leadership development complex	$1,900

Location and project	*Thousands*
Alter electrical distribution system	3,300
Total	5,200

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Gunter Air Force Station, AL: Add to computer facility	[1] $6,000
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Add to and alter historical research center	[2] 2,800

[1] Low design.
[2] Budget constraints.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

The Alaskan Air Command (AAC) is responsible for providing combat ready forces, defense weapons systems, aircraft control and warning element, and air defense forces within Alaska. It also is responsible for providing logistical support for the Strategic Air Command, the Military Airlift Command, the Command of the Alaskan Sea Frontier and the United States Army.

The committee approved $79,860,000 for 13 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Attu Research Site, AK: Seismic operations and data transmission facilities	$910
Total	910
Eielson Air Force Base, AK:	
Maintenance hangar	6,000
Fire protection hangar	4,200
Sound suppressor support	1,550
Refuel vehicle/petrol operations facility	2,200
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,500
Total	19,450
Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK:	
Fire station	1,400
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,600
Total	5,000
King Salmon Airport, AK:	
Add to and alter composite operations facilities	3,000
Fire station	5,600
Total	8,600
Shemya Air Force Base, AK:	
Liquid fuel pipeline system	8,800
Composite personnel housing and alert facility	9,600
Add to and alter central power plant	27,500
Total	45,900

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Eielson Air Force Base, AK: Add to and alter central heat and powerplant	[1] $25,500

[1] Insufficient review for third party financing.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The Military Airlift Command (MAC) is responsible for maintaining the military airlift system in a constant state of readiness. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System and Military Airlift.

The committee approved $149,830,000 for 45 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Altus Air Force Base, OK:	
Vehicle maintenance shop	$3,200
Weapons systems maintenance management facility	2,550
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,800
Total	9,550
Andrews Air Force Base, MD:	
Alter communications facility	3,350
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,550
Facility energy improvements	420
Fire protection various facilities	1,800
Total	10,120
Base 24—classified location, ZI:	
C-130: Support facilities	(6,170)
Add to parking apron	1,500
Squadron operations	1,350
Corrosion control facility	1,300
Add to and alter avionic maintenance facilities	1,200
Organizational maintenance shop	820
Total	6,170
Bolling Air Force Base, DC: Facility energy improvements	250
Total	250
Charleston Air Force Base, SC:	
Petroleum operations facility	480
Aerial refueling part task training facility	1,140
Total	1,620
Dover Air Force Base, DE:	
Extend runway/land acquisition	13,800
Add to and alter aerial refueling part task training	1,050
Add to and alter flight simulator training facility	1,250
Ancillary explosive complex	2,300
Base supply and equipment shed	360
Base hazardous storage facility	430
Total	19,190
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, FL: Alter dining hall	1,700
Total	1,700
Kirtland Air Force Base, NM:	
Dangerous cargo pad	1.900
Communications duct system	1,300
Munitions storage complex	47,000
Computer/vault facility	4,300
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,000

Location and project	*Thousands*
Facility energy improvements	830
Total	60,330
McChord Air Force Base, WA:	
Add to and alter aerial port facility	1,300
Add to and alter aerial refueling part task training facility	940
Total	2,240
McGuire Air Force Base, NJ:	
Aerial refueling part task training facility	1,050
Aircraft maintenance hangars	7,300
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,200
Total	14,550
Norton Air Force Base, CA:	
Security police operations facility	1,900
Control tower	2,200
Facility energy improvements	470
Total	4,570
Pope Air Force Base, NC: Combat arms training and maintenance facility	440
Total	440
Scott Air Force Base, IL:	
Satellite communications ground terminal	4,270
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,000
Land easement	530
Total	8,800
Travis Air Force Base, CA:	
Add to and alter flight simulator training facility	2,000
Base hazardous storage facility	2,100
Weapons systems maintenance management and support facility	6,200
Total	10,300

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Altus Air Force Base, OK:	
Base supply administrative facility	[1] $1,900
Recreation center	[1] 1,710
Bolling Air Force Base, DC: Office of Special Investigations [DSI] building	[1] 12,000
McGuire Air Force Base, NJ: Add to and alter gymnasium	[1] 1,550
Scott Air Force Base, IL: Administrative facility	[1] 550

[1] Budget constraints.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The Pacific Air Forces are responsible for offensive and defensive air operations, and for providing administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved $3,330,000 for two projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Hickam Air Force Base, HI: Facility energy improvements	$480
Total	480
Wheeler Air Force Base, HI: Various aircraft maintenance and support facilities	2,850
Total	2,850

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	Thousands
Wheeler Air Force Base, HI: Gymnasium	[1] 2,200

[1] Budget constraints.

SPACE COMMAND

The Space Command (SPACE CMD) is responsible for operational space assets and the strategic defense mission.

The committee approved $11,250,000 for four projects at the following locations:

Location and project	Thousands
Cape Cod Air Force Station, MA: Pave Paws-Electro magnetic pulse protection	$600
Total	600
Cavalier Air Force Station, ND: Power reliability enhancements	950
Total	950
Clear Air Force Station, AK: Satellite communication ground terminal	4,500
Total	4,500
Peterson Air Force Base, CO: Test, development and training center—phase II	5,200
Total	5,200

SPECIAL PROJECT

Authorization for a special project was requested.

The committee approved $55,000,000 for a special project at an unspecified location:

Location and project	Thousands
Unspecified location: Support facilities	55,000
Total	55,000

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The Strategic Air Command (SAC) is responsible for the bomber, tanker and missile force required for conducting intensive and conclusive worldwide offensive operations.

The committee approved $2,568,124,000 for 81 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Barksdale Air Force Base, LA: Alter fuel systems maintenance dock	$1,400
Total	1,400
Base 34—classified location, ZI:	
Air-launched cruise missile [ALCM] support facilities—phase I.	(8,920)
ALCM:	
Integrated maintenance facility	7,200
Missile roll/transfer and storage	1,400
Site activation task force facility	320
Total	8,920
Beale Air Force Base, CA:	
TR-1:	
Aircraft shelter and apron	3,300
Physiological support division facility	550
Pave Paws:	
Electromagnetic magnetic pulse upgrade	950
Boundary security system	1,050
Total	5,850
Belle Fourche Air Force Station, SD: Strategic training range complex (site 4) and land acquisition	4,080
Total	4,080
Carswell Air Force Base, TX: Willis-Cartwright school acquisition/renovation	1,000
Total	1,000
Castle Air Force Base, CA:	
Approach lighting and land acquisition	2,000
Engine inspection and repair shop	1,300
Total	3,300
Dyess Air Force Base, TX:	
B-1B—Beddown support facilities—phase III	(16,000)
Flight simulator training facility	5,600
Central aircraft support system equipment and installation	4,350
Add to and alter maintenance facilities	1,500
Add to and alter field training facilities	1,300
Munitions igloo	2,300
Blast deflectors	950
Heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning	950
Total	16,950
Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD:	
B-1B—Beddown support facilities—phase II	(62,464)
Alter maintenance hangars	12,400
Aircraft parking apron and taxiways	10,600
Add to and alter alert parking area pavement	7,600
Field maintenance facility	6,300
Area security improvements	3,450
Flight simulator training facility	3,400
Central aircraft support system equipment and installation	3,000
Helicopter/aircrew enhancement facilities	2,850
Blast deflectors	2,850
Alter utilities systems	990
Add to and alter operations and maintenance facilities	710
Alter engine inspection and repair facility	450
Add to and alter organizational aircraft maintenance shop	270
Alter integrated maintenance facilities	210
Weapons preload facilities and rapid deployment system	7,384

Location and project	*Thousands*
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,100
Peacekeeper—add to and alter air launch control center facility	730
KC-135 cockpit procedures trainer simulator facility	770
Total	72,064
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY:	
Peacekeeper—launch facilities site work	6,200
Data processing facility	1,550
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,900
Facility energy improvements	560
Peacekeeper—land easements	2,100
Total	15,310
Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND:	
B-1B—beddown support facilities—phase I	(61,030)
Three bay maintenance hangar and apron	25,000
Hydrant fuel with central aircraft support system provisions	14,300
Add to and alter aircraft maintenance hangars	9,200
Area security improvements	5,200
Alter utilities systems	3,600
Add to and alter field training and site activation task force facilities	960
Alter field maintenance facilities	930
Weapons bay fuel tank storage facility	700
Power check pad	580
Alter avionics maintenance facility	560
Facility energy improvements	1,700
Total	62,730
Griffiss Air Force Base, NY:	
Refuel vehicle heated storage facility	430
Alter tempest secure intelligence laboratory	1,210
Air-launched cruise missile igloo	1,100
Total	2,740
Grissom Air Force Base, IN: Base civil engineering complex—phase II	1,700
Total	1,700
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, MI:	
Air-launched cruise missile [ALCM] support facilities—phase II.	(19,180)
ALCM:	
Weapons storage igloos	6,600
Munitions upload training facility	6,500
Weapons convoy roads	2,650
Support equipment maintenance shop	1,400
Unarmed weapons storage facility	710
Vehicle parking facility	310
Alter operations facilities	360
Support equipment corrision control	650
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,400
Total	22,580
Malmstrom Air Force Base, MI: Facility energy improvements	1,300
Total	1,300
March Air Force Base, CA:	
Air division headquarters	2,200

Location and project	*Thousands*
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,800
Total	9,000
Minot Air Force Base, ND: Security police operations facility	5,000
Total	5,000
Offutt Air Force Base, NE:	
Headquarters command post	5,700
Peacekeeper—add to and alter air launch control center	430
Add to and alter unaccomp enlisted personnel housing/dining hall.	3,400
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing—Silver Creek	550
Energy recovery systems	360
Total	10,440
Pease Air Force Base, NH:	
Refueling vehicle heated storage facility	590
Heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning	610
Total	1,200
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, NY: Facility energy improvements	1,050
Total	1,050
Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA:	
Optical test facility	710
Add to and alter telemetry receiving station	530
Electrical energy systems	720
Total	1,960
Whiteman Air Force Base, MO: Fire station	2,250
Total	2,250
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, MI: Add to and alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,300
Total	5,300

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Beale Air Force Base, CA: Religious education facility	[1] $1,100
Blytheville Air Force Base, AR: Aircraft general purpose maintenance shop	[1] 3,750
Carswell Air Force Base, TX: Chapel center	[1] 2,150
McConnell Air Force Base, KS:	
B-1B—Beddown support facilities—phase I	[1] (71,490)
Hydrant fueling with central aircraft support system provisions	18,400
Two bay aircraft maintenance hangar	17,000
Area security improvement/alert pavements	7,300
Integrated maintenance facilities	6,400
Weapons storage area and igloos	6,300
Weapons convoy roads	3,700
Consolidated operations center	3,500
Add to and alter avionics maintenance facility	2,100
Support equipment and vehicle storage facilities	1,900
Field training facility	1,830
Add to and alter communications and support facilities	1,310
Alter utility systems	1,000
Warhead maintenance/inspection facility	750
Whiteman Air Force Base, MO: Add to and alter gymnasium	[1] 2,400

[1] Budget constraints.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command (TAC) is responsible for tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $162,835,000 for 72 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Bergstrom Air Force Base, TX: Commercial transportation facility	$770
Total	770
Cannon Air Force Base, NM: Melrose Range—land acquisition	12,500
Total	12,500
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, AZ:	
Taxiway lighting	560
Ground-launched cruise missile—field training facility	4,550
Medical war reserve material facility	620
Total	5,730
England Air Force Base, LA:	
Security police operations facility	1,200
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	1,400
Total	2,600
George Air Force Base, CA:	
Fire station	3,400
Sound suppressor support	740
Add to and alter munitions facilities	1,100
Total	5,240
Holloman Air Force Base, NM:	
Vehicle maintenance shop	1,850
Base civil engineering maintenance shop	1,300
Add to and alter radar target scatter complex	13,700
Total	16,850
Homestead Air Force Base, FL:	
F-16 beddown—various support facilities	(3,495)
Alter fuel systems maintenance hangar	1,050
Add to and alter flight simulator facility	1,200
Add to and alter weapons/release system shop	510
Add to and alter Aircraft generation squadron parts store	410
Add to and alter various maintenance facilities	325
Vehicle maintenance shop and operations facilities	900
Munitions facilities	970
Visiting officers quarters	1,650
Total	7,015
Langley Air Force Base, VA:	
Sound suppressor support	480
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	8,200
Total	8,680
Luke Air Force Base, AZ:	
F-16—beddown support facilities	(12,440)
Aircraft maintenance and training facility	3,650
Squadron operations facility	2,900
Fuel systems maintenance hangar	2,000
Wing headquarters facility	1,350

Location and project	*Thousands*
Add to and alter engine inspection and repair shop	1,750
Aircraft maintenance unit facility	790
Support equipment shop	2,050
Heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning	290
Total	14,780
MacDill Air Force Base, FL:	
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	500
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,000
Alter base roads	2,850
Total	7,350
Moody Air Force Base, GA:	
F-16 beddown—various support facilities	(10,600)
Avionics shop	3,200
Add to and alter operations/maintenance facilities	2,950
Flight simulator training facility	1,600
Add to and alter field training facility	1,600
Add to and alter engine inspection and repair shop	1,250
Aircraft maintenance unit facility	800
Sound suppressor support	980
Various munitions storage/operations facilities	6,900
Alter electric distribution system	4,750
Total	24,030
Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID:	
Over the Horizon-Backscatter radar operations/software support	12,400
Control tower	2,200
Total	14,600
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, SC: Add to and alter support equipment shop	430
Total	430
Nellis Air Force Base, NV:	
Red Flag support facilities	2,800
Alter aircraft corrosion control facility	2,050
Sound suppressor support	610
Precision location strike system—software support facility	2,800
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	9,600
Total	17,860
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, NC:	
KC-10 blast deflectors and apron lighting	1,100
Heating ventilation, and air-conditioning	1,220
Total	2,320
Shaw Air Force Base, SC:	
Add to and alter special operations facilities	2,000
Medical war reserve material facility	450
Add to and alter weapons system maintenance management facility	1,100
Consolidated support center	6,450
Wing headquarters	2,100
Heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning	360
Aircraft maintenance area lighting	840
Total	13,300
Tyndall Air Force Base, FL:	
Arm/disarm pad	980
Weapons evaluation/operations facility	2,650

Location and project	*Thousands*
Consolidated training facility	1,550
Aircraft combat maneuvering instrumentation facility	1,100
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,500
Total	8,780

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, AZ: Base civil engineer administrative facility	[1]$2,500
England Air Force Base, LA: Base civil engineer administrative facility	[1]2,300
George Air Force Base, CA:	
Resource management facility	[1]7,400
Visiting personnel quarters	[1]7,600
MacDill Air Force Base, FL:	
Base contracting facility	[1]1,300
Add to and alter headquarters, Readiness Command	[1]1,500
Nellis Air Force Base, NV: Consolidated support center	[1]6,000

[1] Budget constraints.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The United States Air Force Academy (USAF) is responsible for educating and training young men and women to become officers in the U.S. Air Force.

The committee approved $10,310,000 for seven projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
United States Air Force Academy, CO:	
Add to and alter aeronautics laboratory	$3,400
Add to and alter prep school facilities	3,400
Add to and alter prep school fields	270
Add to and alter vehicle maintenance shop	900
Add to and alter computer center	440
Heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning	1,500
Recycle cooling water	400
Total	10,310

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

The Military Airlift Command (MAC) is responsible for maintaining the military airlift system in a constant state of readiness. MAC supervises and operates the Air Weather Service, the Air Rescue and Recovery Service, Aeromedical Evacuation System, and Military Airlift.

The committee approved $28,785,000 for eight projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Lajes Field, Portugal:	
Petroleum, oil, lubricants storage tanks	$19,435
Refueling vehicle maintenance shop	1,250
Add to and alter cold storage	1,650
Add to and alter chapel	1,850

Location and project	*Thousands*
Child care center	1,100
Total	25,285
Rhein-Main AB, Germany:	
Flight simulator training facility	2,000
Cold storage facility	570
Religious education facility	930
Total	3,500

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Rhein-Main AB, Germany: Add to and alter air passenger terminal	[1] $10,100

[1] Budget constraints.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

The Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) are responsibile for offensive and defensive air operations, and for providing administrative and logistical support for Air Force units in the Pacific geographical area.

The committee approved $129,930,000 for 35 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Camp Zama, Japan: Add to and alter satellite communications ground terminal	1,500
Total	1,500
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines:	
Consolidated support facilities—Phase II	4,400
Add to and alter maintenance management and operation facilities	1,750
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,650
Emergency backup power	2,800
Add to and alter water distribution system	800
Security and safety improvements	1,650
Total	15,050
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean: Munitions storage facility—phase II	5,300
Total	5,300
Kadena Air Base, Japan:	
Tactical control operations facility	2,950
Aircraft maintenance facilities—phase I	12,600
Add to engine inspection and repair shop	5,400
Sound suppressor support	600
Jet fuel storage (JP-4)	6,100
Total	27,650
Kimhae Air Base, Korea: Medical contingency complex	10,400
Total	10,400
Kunsan Air Base, Korea:	
Portomod facility support	300
Aircraft maintenance unit facility	1,950
Consolidated support facility	2,850

Location and project	*Thousands*
Add to and alter electrical distribution system—phase I	3,900
Total	9,000
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea:	
Portomod facility support	260
Quick turn facility	9,000
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	4,950
Unaccompanied officer personnel housing	650
Add to and alter water treatment storage/distribution system	1,450
Total	16,310
Misawa Air Base, Japan:	
Commando port support—phase III. (CPIII)	(9,500)
Concrete arch igloo magazine	2,850
Jet fuel storage	4,500
Aboveground storage magazine	2,150
Total	9,500
Osan Air Base, Korea:	
Protomod facility support	860
Aircraft shelters	6,800
Korean combat operations intelligence center allied support—phase II	500
Squadron operations facilities	6,200
Munitions maintenance and storage facilities—phase I	7,000
Alter unaccompanied officer personnel housing	3,150
Total	24,510
Sachon Air Base, Korea: Portomod facility support	310
Total	310
Yokota Air Base, Japan:	
Hydrant fueling system	8,500
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning	1,900
Total	10,400

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Yokota Air Base, Japan: Base supply administrative facility	[1] $3,350

[1] Seek JFIP funding.

SPACE COMMAND

The Space Command (SPACE CMD) is responsible for operational space assets and the strategic defense mission.

The committee approved $38,450,000 for 10 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Fylingdales Ballistic Missile Early Warning System Site 3, United Kingdom: Satellite communications ground terminal	$3,100
Total	3,100
Pirinclik Air Base, Turkey: Satellite communications ground terminal	2,600
Total	2,600
Site 5—classified location, Portugal	
Spacetrack observation facility	12,400

Location and project	*Thousands*
Composite support facility	2,250
Total	14,650
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland:	
Consolidated port facility	2,550
Refueling vehicle heated storage facility	1,000
Laundry	2,200
Total	5,750
Thule Air Base, Greenland:	
Add to and alter ground terminal support facility	5,800
Cold storage facility	4,300
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,250
Total	12,350

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

The Tactical Air Command (TAC) is responsible for tactical air operations and strategic defense of the United States.

The committee approved $23,172,000 for two projects at the following location:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Howard Air Force Base, Panama Canal Zone:	
Add to aircraft apron	$21,000
Facility energy improvements	2,172
Total	23,172

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

The U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) are responsible for offensive and defensive air operations in Europe and in other areas not included in either the NATO or U.S. Commander-in-Chief Europe area of responsibilities.

The committee approved $263,400,000 for 143 projects at the following locations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany: Aircraft maintenance unit facility	$350
Total	350
Alconbury Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
TR-1 support facilities	(10,700)
Add to and alter squadron operations facility	1,050
Chemical warfare protect-sensor maintenance facility	1,850
Chemical warfare protect-avionic maintenance facility	2,200
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	5,600
Add to and alter fire station	1,600
Base operations	900
Flight simulator training facility	1,150
Sound suppressor support	400
Add to and alter warehouse	1,700
Facility energy improvements	2,650
Alter electrical distibution system	1,450

Location and project	*Thousands*
Add to water distribution system	360
Total	20,910
Ankara Air Station, Turkey: Transient lodging facility	950
Total	950
Aviano Air Base, Italy:	
Telecommunications facility	920
Visiting officer quarters	4,150
Total	5,070
Base 25—classified location, USAFE: Satellite communications ground terminal	4,500
Total	4,500
Base 29—classified location, overseas:	
Precision location strike system [PLSS]—support facilities	(3,500)
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,400
Operations and maintenance facility	1,100
Total	3,500
Base 30—classified location, overseas:	
TR-1—support facilities	(4,830)
Ground station	4,500
Add to and alter dining hall	330
Total	4,830
Base 33—classified location, overseas:	
Compass Call—Beddown support facilities	(9,450)
C-130:	
Aircraft maintenance complex	7,250
Site support work	1,600
Security fence	600
Total	9,450
Bentwaters Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Aircraft maintenance facility	900
Add to aircraft engine inspection and repair shop	2,100
Vehicle maintenance complex	4,050
Warehouse	2,200
Add to and alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,800
Total	12,050
Bitburg Air Base, Germany:	
Weapons system maintenance control	2,200
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,250
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,600
Total	9,050
Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands:	
Telecommunications facility	860
Add to and alter general purpose maintenance complex	1,850
Total	2,710
Chicksands Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Add to and alter clinic	830

Location and project	*Thousands*
Child care center	800
Total	1,630
Comiso Air Station, Italy:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—various support facilities	(6,280)
Consolidated open mess	3,000
Exchange complex	3,280
Total	6,280
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy:	
Visiting airmen quarters	1,900
Visiting officer quarters	900
Total	2,800
Eiensiedlerhof Storage Annex, Germany: Visiting officer quarters	2,900
Total	2,900
Europe, various locations, overseas:	
Chemical warfare protection	(4,450)
Camp New Amsterdam, Netherlands—avionics shop	1,450
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey—2 squadron operations facilities	1,400
Lahr Air Base, Germany—2 squadron operations facilities	1,600
Total	4,450
Fairford Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom: Clinic/dental clinic	7,400
Total	7,400
Florennes Air Base, Belgium:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—various support facilities	(5,860)
Consolidated open mess	1,950
Chapel center	1,750
Clothing sales store	240
Child care center	810
Base support warehouse/open storage	1,110
Total	5,860
Germany, various locations:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—vehicle corrosion facility	580
Precision location strike system—Navigation beacon sites	360
Total	940
Greenham Common Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—support facilities	(2,200)
High frequency communications facility	1,400
Youth center	800
Total	2,200
Hahn Air Base, Germany:	
Alter control tower	560
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,700
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personel housing	2,800
Chapel center	2,100
Total	8,160
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany:	
Base engineer maintenance shop	490

Location and project	*Thousands*
Warehouse	740
Total	1,230
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey:	
Telecommunications facility	770
Satellite communications ground terminal	2,600
Medical contingency facility	1,150
Consolidated support center	4,500
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,250
Lighting systems	300
Total	11,570
Kapaun Air Station, Germany: Telecommunications facility	900
Total	900
Karatas Communications Station, Turkey: Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,330
Total	2,330
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands: Digital European backbone communications facility	270
Total	270
Lakenheath Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Add to and alter vehicle maintenance shop	2,870
Munitions storage igloos	2,250
Warehouse	2,700
Gymnasium	2,500
Total	10,320
Leipheim Air Base, Germany: Aircraft maintance unit facility	350
Total	350
Marienfelde Communication Station, Germany: Add to and alter special operations facility	2,550
Total	2,550
Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Dangerous cargo pad	900
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,580
Weatherization	600
Total	4,080
Molesworth Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Ground-launched cruse missile [GLCM]—various support facilities	(21,063)
Vehicle maintenance complex (Alconbury)	4,050
Add to post office (Alconbury)	530
Utilities/pavements and roads	7,213
Dining hall	1,550
High frequency communications facility	1,400
Security police operations facility	1,150
Fire station	860
Vehicle corrosion control facility	700
Telecommunications/meteorological facility	640
Medical aid station facility	490
Helicopter pad facility	430
Communications equipment facility	410
Tower support	340
Vehicle operations complex	200

Location and project	*Thousands*
Small arms training complex	1,100
Total	21,063
Morocco, various locations:	
Airfield improvements	(3,100)
Apron lighting	2,050
Alter maintenance hanger	550
Water storage	500
Total	3,100
Norvenich Air Base, Germany: Aircraft maintenance unit facility	350
Total	350
Pruem Air Station, Germany:	
Warehouse	710
Operations facility	540
Total	1,250
Ramstein Air Base, Germany:	
Composite alert facilities	2,050
Alter control tower	360
Munitions storage	850
Rapid runway repair equipment storage facility	1,000
Warehouse	1,900
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,200
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,750
Dining hall	1,600
Facility energy improvements	960
Total	14,670
San Vito Air Station, Italy:	
Education center	490
Add to and alter water treatment system	1,100
Total	1,590
Sculthorpe Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom: Munitions storage igloos	2,350
Total	2,350
Sembach Air Base, Germany:	
Alter control tower	360
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	6,100
Total	6,460
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany:	
Telecommunications facility	820
Field training facility	2,100
Rapid runway repair equipment storage facility	910
Passive defense equipment storage facility	530
Warehouse	1,400
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	3,450
Alter unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,900
Base road and utilities	2,750
Total	14,860
Torrejon Air Base, Spain:	
Aircraft maintenance unit complex	2,550
Aircraft corrosion control facility	1,850
Medical contingency complex	2,900

Location and project	*Thousands*
Child care center	1,000
Steam and condensate system	350
Facility energy improvements	900
Alter electrical substation	2,637
Total	12,187
United Kingdom, various locations: Northern Europe tracking station	3,600
Total	3,600
Upper Heyford Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Telecommunication facility	630
Religious education facility	1,200
Facility energy improvements	910
Alter water distribution system	1,900
Total	4,640
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany: Child care center	1,250
Total	1,250
Vught Communications Site, Germany: Digital European backbone communications facility	310
Total	310
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany: Road and railroad siding	1,700
Total	1,700
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—various support facilities	(15,980)
Site activation support facilities	10,000
Utilities/pavements/roads	3,800
Command, control and safety measures	1,900
Boundary fence	280
Total	15,980
Zaragoza Air Base, Spain:	
Control tower	1,650
Support equipment shop	1,100
Total	2,750
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany:	
European distribution system [EDS]—support facilities	(3,600)
Forward storage warehouse	1,150
Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing	2,450
Add to and alter fire station	1,350
Telecommunications facility	750
Total	5,700

The committee did not authorize the following projects:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Greenham Common Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) various suppport facilities:	
Auto hobby shop	[1]$340
Alter arts and crafts center	[1]300
Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom: Consolidated support center	[1]4,150
Ramstein Air Base, Germany: Indoor swimming pool	[2]2,800
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]:	
Telecommunications center	[3]400

Location and project	*Thousands*
Add to and alter communications equipment facility	[3]720
Fire station	[3]1,100
Tower support	[3]300
High-frequency facility	[3]1,500

[1] Budget constraints.
[2] Not justified.
[3] Contingent on favorable deployment decision by The Netherlands.

The committee reduced the following projects by the amount shown:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands: Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]—utilities/pavements/roads	[1]–$2,700

[1] Contingent on favorable deployment decision by The Netherlands.

SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

The support activities include resources for accomplishing design work on fiscal year 1986, 1987, 1988 and subsequent years' military construction projects, for unspecified minor construction and for accomplishing urgent requirements anticipated to arise during fiscal year 1986.

The committee approved $166,096,000 for the following elements of the support program:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Various locations, worldwide:	
Architectural and engineering services	$144,096
Unspecified minor construction	22,000
Total	166,096

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The Air Force requested $30,240,000 for their portion of the Defense Access Roads account at the following installations:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Nellis Air Force Base, NE: Add to and alter base access roads	$3,200
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY: Peacekeeper—access road	27,040
Total	30,240

SUMMARY OF AIR FORCE CHANGES

A summary of the committee recommendations by project is as follows:

Location and project	*Thousands*
Military construction: Total Air Force authorization request	$1,973,350
Committee reductions:	
Air Force Logistics Command:	
Tinker Air Force Base, OK: Add to and alter recreation center	–1,600
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH: Add to and alter science engineering and support complex	–12,800
Air Force Systems Command:	
Arnold Engineering Development Center, TN: Engine analysis facility	–16,900
Hanscom Air Force Base, MA: Library and education center	–2,450
Air Reserve Forces: Billy Mitchell Field, WI: Administration facility	–500
Air Training Command: Goodfellow Air Force Base, TX: Recreation center	–2,450

Location and project	*Thousands*
Air University:	
Gunter Air Force Station, AL: Add to computer facility	–6,000
Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Add to and alter historical research center	–2,800
Alaskan Air Command: Eielson Air Force Base, AK: Add to and alter central heat and powerplant	–25,500
Military Airlift Command:	
Altus Air Force Base, OK:	
Base supply administration facility	–1,900
Recreation center	–1,710
Bolling Air Force Base, DC: Office of special investigations building	–12,000
McGuire Air Force Base, NJ: Add to and alter gymnasium	–1,550
Scott Air Force Base, IL: Administration facility	–550
Pacific Air Forces:	
Wheeler Air Force Base, HI: Gymnasium	–2,200
Strategic Air Command:	
Beale Air Force Base, CA: Religious education facility	–1,100
Blytheville Air Force Base, AR: Aircraft general purpose maintenance facility	–3,750
Carswell Air Force Base, TX: Chapel center	–2,150
McConnell Air Force Base, KS: B–1B support facilities	–71,490
Whiteman Air Force Base, MO: Add to and alter gymnasium	–2,400
Tactical Air Command:	
Davis Monthan Air Force Base, AZ: Base civil engineering administrative facility	–2,500
England Air Force Base, LA: Base civil engineering administrative facility	–2,300
George Air Force Base, CA:	
Resource management facility	–7,400
Visiting personnel quarters	–7,600
MacDill Air Force Base, FL:	
Add to and alter Readiness Command headquarters facility	–1,500
Base contracting facility	–1,300
Nellis Air Force Base, NV: Consolidated support center	–6,000
Military Airlift Command (outside the U.S.): Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany: Add to and alter air passenger terminal	–10,100
Pacific Air Forces (outside the U.S.): Yokota Air Base, Japan: Base supply administration facility	–3,350
United States Air Forces in Europe:	
Greenham Common Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]:	
Alter arts/crafts shop	–300
Auto hobby shop	–340
Mildenhall Royal Air Force Base, United Kingdom: Consolidated support center	–4,150
Ramstein Air Base, Germany: Indoor swimming pool	–2,800
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands:	
Ground-launched cruise missile [GLCM]:	
Telecommunications center	–400
Add to and alter communications equipment facility	–720
Fire station	–1,100
Tower support	–300
High frequency facility	–1,500
Utilities/pavements/roads	–2,700
Subtotal of actions	–228,160
General reduction for bid savings	–50,000
Total military construction authorization for appropriations	1,695,190

FAMILY HOUSING

The Air Force's request for the Family Housing program and the committee's recommendations are as follows:

AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	Air Force request	Committee approved
Construction:		
New family housing (1,880 units requested)	148,100	146,300
Post acquisition	61,300	61,300
Architect and engineer services	5,000	5,000
Total construction	214,400	212,600
Operation and maintenance:		
Operating expenses	333,530	333,530
Maintenace	332,350	332,350
Total operation and maintenance	665,880	665,880
Leasing:		
Foreign	45,402	45,402
Domestic	2,711	2,711
Total leasing	48,113	48,113
Debt payment:		
Principal	14,298	14,298
Interest and other expenses	700	700
Servicemen's mortgage insurance premiums	307	307
Total debt payment	15,305	15,305
Total Air Force housing request	943,698	941,898
Total authorized for appropriation		941,898

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Family Housing new construction is intended to reduce the housing deficit where the private community does not provide sufficient adequate housing to support the Air Force mission. The committee approved $146,300,000 for seven projects (1,880 units) at the following locations:

Location	Project units	Cost (thousands)
Belle Fourche, Strategic Training Range, SD	50	$4,000
Florennes Air Base, Belgium	400	29,200
Hahn Air Base, Germany	440	33,000
Ramstein Air Base, Germany	400	30,000
Osan Air Base, Korea	(1)	[2]1,200
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands	140	11,000
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines	450	37,900

[1] Support.

[2] Family housing office and warehouse.

The committee did not authorize the following project:

Location	Project units	Cost (thousands)
Fort MacArthur, CA	Land	[1]$1,800

[1] Land exchange without cost.

POST ACQUISITION CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $61,300,000 for 86 projects at various locations, including $19,981,000 for energy conservation investment improvements and 9 projects where the per unit cost for improvement and repair exceeds the statutory limitation ($30,000 times the area cost factor).

ARCHITECT AND ENGINEER SERVICES

The committee approved $5,000,000 for planning and design work on fiscal year 1986 and future year military family housing construction projects, both new and post acquisition.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The committee approved $665,800,000 for family housing operation and maintenance. Reimbursements are anticipated to be $15,000,000.

LEASING

The committee approved $45,402,000 for foreign leases and $2,711,000 for domestic leases.

DEBT PAYMENT

The committee approved $15,305,000 for principal and interest payments on mortgaged Capehart and Wherry housing units and Servicemen's Mortgage Insurance premiums.

SUMMARY OF FAMILY HOUSING ACTIONS

	Thousands
Authorization request	$943,698
Fort MacArthur, CA: Land acquisition	–1,800
Subtotal reductions	1,800
Total authorization for appropriations	941,898

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

The administration requested authorization of $366,925,000. The committee approved $337,725,000 for the following programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Defense agencies request	Total authorization	Less amounts not authorized for appropriation	Total authorized for appropriation
Military construction:				
Inside the United States	180,847	151,647	[1] 70,545	81,102
Outside the United States	126,778	126,778	20,180	106,598
Planning and design	30,000	30,000		30,000
Unspecified minor construction	4,000	4,000		4,000
Secretary of Defense contingency	5,000	5,000		5,000
Total MILCON authorized	346,625	317,425	90,725	226,700
Military family housing:				
Construction, improvements, and design	1,910	1,910		1,910
Support	18,390	18,390		18,390
Total family housing	20,300	20,300		20,300
Grand total, Defense agencies	366,925	337,725	90,725	247,000

[1] −$16,845,000 general reduction for savings inside the United States and −$53,700,000 for incremental funding of the National Security Agency Research and Engineering facility at Ft. Meade, Maryland.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM

The Secretary of Defense's military construction request for the Defense agencies totaled $366,925,000 for fiscal year 1986. Included in this total are: $307,625,000 for major construction of new facilities and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 26 locations within the United States and at 32 locations overseas; $5 million for contingency construction authorization for the Secretary of Defense to provide for unforeseen construction requirements in emergency situations; $30,000,000 for planning and design; $4,000,000 for unspecified minor construction projects, $1,910,000 for family housing construction and improvements; and $18,390,000 for family housing support.

The committee gave careful consideration to all projects and related support. The following table summarizes the authorization requested and approved:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1986 request	Committee approved
Defense Logistics Agency	56,150	56,150
Defense Mapping Agency	900	900
National Security Agency	89,292	89,292
Secretary of Defense activities	161,283	132,083
Department of Defense dependents schools	(116,941)	(116,941)
Overseas	(85,335)	(85,335)
Section 6	(31,606)	(31,606)
Classified activities	(15,142)	(15,142)
National Defense University	(29,200)	0
OSD contingency construction	5,000	5,000
Unspecified minor construction	4,000	4,000
Planning and design	30,000	30,000
Family housing	20,300	20,300
New construction and improvements	(1,910)	(1,910)
Support	(18.390)	(18,390)
Subtotal	366,925	337,725
General reduction for savings		−37,025
Total	366,925	300,700

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Logistics Agency is to provide services and supplies used in common by all of the military services. The agency provides support in the areas of supply, contract administration, technical services, and property disposal to the military services, Federal agencies and certain foreign governments.

The committee approved 25 projects at the following 23 locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Defense property disposal office, Anchorage, AL	Conforming storage facility	1,390
Defense property disposal office:		
Alameda, CA	Facility rehabilitation	1,320
Barstow, CA	Conforming storage facility	825
Defense fuel support point:		
San Diego, CA	Lube oil tankage	600
San Pedro, CA	Fire protection	700
Groton, CT	Conforming storage facility	625
Port Tampa, FL	Fire protection	595
Defense property disposal office, Fort Riley, KA	Covered storage	965
Defense fuel support point:		
Newington, N.H.	Fire protection	1,040
Verona, N.Y.	Fuel tank roofs	1,395
Defense depot:		
Mechanicsburg, PA	Fumigation facility	470
Memphis, TN	Hazardous material warehouse	7,345
	Upgrade water distribution system	740
Defense property disposal office, Texarkana, TX	Storage facility	2,635
Defense depot, Ogden, UT	Hazardous material warehouse	3,315
	Steam distribution system	510
Defense property disposal office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, UT	Facility rehabilitation	750

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Defense general supply center, Richmond, VA	Compressed gas storage facility	3,400
	Expand mechanized freight terminal	1,955
Defense property disposal office, Richmond, VA	Conforming storage facility	650
Defense fuel support point, Manchester, WA	Lube oil facility	565
Defense property disposal office:		
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, WY	Covered storage	1,020
Kaiserslautern, Germany	Administrative facility	360
Defense fuel support point:		
Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan	Fuel tankage	8,160
Tsuuimi, Japan	Fuel pier	2,800
Pyongtaek, Korea	Fuel tankage	5,820
Uijongbu, Korea	do	6,200

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

The mission of the Defense Mapping Agency is to acquire or develop and to supply maps, charts, and other geodetic information required by the Department of Defense.

The committee approved $900,000 for one project at the following location:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Mineral Wells National Guard Station, Mineral Wells, TX	Reproducible materials Secure storage facilities	900

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The mission of the National Security Agency is to organize, and manage activities and facilities for the production of foreign intelligence information.

The committee approved six projects at the following locations:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Fort George G. Meade, MD	Outdweller	6,000
	Research and engineering facility	[1] 75,064
	Support activity building 2:	
	Equipment platform	450
	Test pad	628
Classified location	Emergency generators	2,500
Classified location	Marcher	4,650

[1] $21,364,000 authorized for appropriation.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The committee approved $132,083,000 for various activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense including three classified projects, 26 projects for overseas dependents schools, and 7 projects for Section 6 (CONUS) schools.

The committee acknowledges that this is the second year in which Section 6 school requirements have been included in the military construction program since the Department of Defense was authorized to construct such facilities. The committee continues to support the need for adequate schools for children living on military installations and has approved the seven projects requested for that purpose.

The committee approved the following projects:

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
Office of Dependents Schools:		
Florennes, Belgium	Elementary and high school	7,420
Naval Air Station, Bermuda	Elementary school	2,290
Babenhausen, Germany	Elementary school addition	760
Bamberg, Germany	......do	3,390
	Middle and high school addition	2,410
Butzbach, Germany	Elementary school addition	3,420
Hanau, Germany	Middle school	7,480
Heidelberg, Germany	Elementary school No. 2 addition	1,910
Heilbronn, Germany	Elementary/junior high school addition	2,520
Pirmasens, Germany	Elementary/junior high school additions	1,630
Schweinfurt, Germany	Junior high school	3,930
Semhach Air Base, Germany	Elementary school addition	2,170
Vilseck, Germany	Elementary school	6,680
Sigonella, Italy	Elementary and high school addition	5,360
Misawa Air Base, Japan	Elementary school addition	4,780
Okinawa, Japan	Elementary school (Jennings)	445
	High school addition (Kadena)	300
Osan Air Base, Korea	Elementary school addition	2,780
Pusan, Korea	Elementary and high school addition	1,540
Taegu, Korea	......do	730
Soesterberg, The Netherlands	High school addition	4,460
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippiness	High school (Wagner)	7,190
Rota, Spain	Elementary and high school addition	2,870
Bicester, United Kingdom	Elementary shool	4,570
Upwood, United Kingdom	Elementary school addition	3,240
RAF Woodbridge, United Kingdom	......do	1,060
Subtotal overseas schools		85,335
Department of Defense Section 6 schools:		
Fort Benning, GA	Elementary schools additions	1,693
Fort Bragg, NC	Bowley elementary school replacement	5,660
Camp Lejeune, NC	High school	8,400
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, SC	Woodlawn Park School addition	1,400
Quantico, VA	Elementary school	3,500
Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico	High school	9,753
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, PR	High school improvements	1,200
Subtotal Section 6 schools		31,606
Classified activities:		
Classified location	Classified project	12,000
Do	......do	3,142
Subtotal classified activities		15,142

The committee did not approve the following project. Section 2189 requires land transfer without cost. Construction funds denied due to lack of project approval from National Capital Planning Commission.

[In thousands of dollars]

Location	Project	Cost
National Defense University, Fort McNair, DC	Academic instruction facility	29,200

CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved the $5,000,000 requested in new authorization for unforeseen contingency construction requirements. The committee feels this amount is adequate in view of the present balance in this account.

UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION

The committee approved $4,000,000 for unspecified minor construction projects authorized under title 10 U.S.C. 2805. This is considered adequate to enable the numerous Defense Agencies and Activities to react to requirements resulting from unforeseen situations which could affect mission performance or safety of life or property, and to take advantage of opportunities to attain greater efficiency of operations

PLANNING AND DESIGN

The committee approved the $30,000,000 requested for planning and design to support the timely design of Defense Agency projects proposed for inclusion in outyear programs.

FAMILY HOUSING

The committee approved the $20,300,000 requested for Military Family Housing to support the Defense Agencies. The details of this amount are as follows:

FAMILY HOUSING—DEFENSE AGENCIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Defense Mapping Agency	Defense Intelligence Agency	National Security Agency	Defense Logistics Agency	Total
New construction			1,800		1,800
Improvements			70	40	110
Subtotal			1,870	40	1,910
Operation	23	2,143	543	185	2,894
Leasing	33	8,900	6,000		14,933
Maintenance	31		292	240	563
Subtotal	87	11,043	6,835	425	18,390
Total	87	11,043	8,705	465	20,300

Summary of Defense Agencies Program Action

	Thousands
Total defense agency authorization request	$366,925
Military construction:	
Total Defense agency authorization request	346,625
Committee reductions:	
National Defense University, Fort McNair, District of Columiba	−29,200
Total reductions	29,200
New military construction authorization	317,425
Family housing:	
Total Defense agency authorization request	20,300
New family housing authorization	20,300
New Defense agency military construction and family housing authorization	337,725

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE NATO AUTHORIZATION

The Secretary of Defense requested $98,000,000 under this title for the U.S. contribution to the NATO common-funded Infrastructure Program in fiscal year 1986. The committee is very supportive of the NATO Infrastructure Program and believes that the majority of construction requirements for Europe should be funded by it. It is essential to the United States that NATO fund our high priority facility to meet our obligations to pay our share of this vital program. The Committee approved the full $98,000,000 request.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The authorization of appropriations and administrative provisions contained in Title VI are designed to provide certain restrictions as well as relief in execution of the authorization contained in the act. With relatively few exceptions they are essentially the same as those recurring provisions contained in past military construction authorization acts.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 2161 through 2165 contain language which appears in each annual military construction Act except the dollar amounts now include the amounts of authorizations contained in the titles of this Act. It authorizes the appropriation of funds to carry out the functions authorized by separate titles of the Act.

EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS: EXTENSIONS OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATION

Section 2166 is similar to the repeal provision in last year's act and continues in affect their previously established policy of repealing military construction authorizations that have not been used within a specified period after enactment. This section also exempts the following projects from repeal:

Two Army fiscal year 1984 heating system projects at Stuttgart, Germany, for which contracts cannot be awarded before October 1985 because of additional time required to complete an economic analysis to determine if the heating systems are more cost effective than district heat connections. District heat connections would also require congressional notification of scope substitution.

An Army fiscal year 1984 range modernization project at Wildflecken, Germany, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985 because of a redesign necessary to satisfy environmental concerns. The current estimate exceeds the programmed amount and will require a cost variation report and reprogramming request to Congress.

All projects are being held in abeyance pending resolution of contracting procedures in Greece.

Three Army fiscal year 1984 projects at Argyroupolis, Greece, for which contracts cannot be awarded before October 1985

Three Army fiscal year 1984 projects at Penivolaki, Greece, for which contracts cannot be awarded before October 1985

An Army fiscal year 1984 physical fitness training center project at Elefsis, Greece, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985

A Navy fiscal year 1984 project at Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985

A Navy fiscal year 1984 project at Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985 because of a redesign requirement based on severe operational problems experienced with a similar design at Naval Air Station, Lemoore California.

A Navy fiscal year 1984 land acquisition at Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California, which cannot be consummated before October 1985 due to unresolved environmental issues involving the closing of several county roads.

A Navy fiscal year 1984 generator plant project at Naval Communications Area Master Station Eastern Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985 because of a pending court order not due to be issued before that time.

An Air Force fiscal year 1984 air freight terminal project at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, for which a contract cannot be awarded before October 1985, because a requirement to redesign and resite the structure could extend beyond that date.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

Section 2167 continues the procedure of establishing certain thresholds for the forthcoming Military Construction program. The table below compares the amounts specified by law for fiscal year 1984 to those approved by the committee for fiscal year 1985:

	Fiscal year—	
	1985	1986
1. Maximum amount for unspecified minor construction	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
2. Amount for reporting A/E contracts	$300,000	$300,000
3. Maximum amount per unit for family housing improvement	$30,000	$30,000
4. Maximum annual rental for family housing in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam	$6,000	$10,000
5. A. Maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country	$16,800	$16,800
B. Maximum number of family housing units that may be leased in foreign countries at any one time	30,000	32,000
6. Maximum rental per year for family housing facilities leased in a foreign country	$250,000	$250,000

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2168 makes the provisions of titles I, II, III, IV, and V effective October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Enacted fiscal year 1985	Requested fiscal year 1986	Committee approved
Army National Guard	101,683	102,100	102,100
Major construction	(73,630)	(70,821)	(70,821)
Minor construction	(19,053)	(18,917)	(18,917)
Planning and design	(9,000)	(12,362)	(12,362)
Army Reserve	71,700	70,700	70,900
Major construction	(57,650)	(55,295)	(55,295)
Minor construction	(5,550)	(5,800)	(5,800)
Planning and design	(8,500)	(9,605)	(9,805)
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	62,000	51,800	51,800
Major construction	(55,705)	(46,060)	(46,060)
Minor construction	(2,895)	(1,540)	(1,540)
Planning and design	(3,400)	(4,200)	(4,200)
Air National Guard	121,200	137,200	130,055
Major construction	(105,300)	(119,600)	(112,455)
Minor construction	(7,900)	(8,000)	(8,000)
Planning and design	(8,000)	(9,600)	(9,600)
Air Force Reserve	67,800	66,800	66,800
Major construction	(60,900)	(58,400)	(58,400)
Minor construction	(2,250)	(3,400)	(3,400)
Planning and design	(4,650)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Total	424,383	428,600	421,655
Major construction	(353,185)	(350,176)	(343,031)
Minor construction	(37,648)	(37,657)	(37,657)
Planning and design	(33,550)	(40,767)	(40,967)

The authorization of appropriations request for fiscal year 1986 totals $428,600,000, including major construction, minor construction, and planning and design in support of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces. The committee recognizes the increasingly vital role of the Guard and Reserve Forces in improving the readiness capability of the total military force.

The following summary represents the status of lump sum authorization provided continuously since the Guard and Reserve Forces facilities program reverted to this method of authorization in 1963:

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATION [1] AS OF MAR. 1, 1985

[In thousands of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve		National Guard	Reserve	
Lump sum authorization (cumulative fiscal years 1963–85)	743,330	612,957	417,715	857,490	316,747	2,948,239

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—ESTIMATED STATUS OF LUMP SUM AUTHORIZATION [1] AS OF MAR. 1, 1985—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Army		Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	Air Force		Total
	National Guard	Reserve		National Guard	Reserve	
Estimate of authorization to be committed through fiscal year 1985	730,023	608,849	413,347	835,534	316,747	2,904,500
Uncommitted balance	13,307	4,108	4,368	21,956	0	43,739
Added by present bill	102,100	70,900	51,800	130,055	66,800	421,455
Total available, fiscal year 1986	115,407	75,008	56,168	152,011	66,800	465,394
Estimated commitments in fiscal year 1986	102,100	70,583	52,020	128,855	66,800	420,358
Estimated residual authorization, end fiscal year 1986	13,307	4,425	4,148	23,156	0	45,036

[1] Figures include planning and design and minor construction for fiscal year 1984–86 in accordance with Public Law 97–214.

SUMMARY OF GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES PROGRAM CHANGES

	Thousands
Total Guard and Reserve forces authorization request	$428,600
Army National Guard	102,100
Army Reserve	70,700
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	51,800
Air National Guard	137,200
Air Force Reserve	66,800
Committee additions:	
Army Reserve—Palnning and design	(200)
Total additions	+200
Committee reductions:	
Air National Guard:	
W. K. Kellogg Regional Airport, Battle Creek, MI: Fuel system maintenance dock	1,700
McConnell AFB, KS:	
Fire supression system	775
Weapons calibration facility	1,500
Add/alter hangar building 41	2,500
Aerospace ground equipment and shop	670
Subtotal	5,445
Total reductions	7,145
New Guard and Reserve forces authorization	421,655
Army National Guard	102,100
Army Reserve	70,900
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	51,800
Air National Guard	130,055
Air Force Reserve	66,800

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The general provisions contained in title VIII are nonrecurring provisions which for the most part amend previous statutes and which are designed to grant new authorities to the Secretaries of the Military Departments or the Directors of the Defense Agencies. The enactment of these provisions will provide the Department of Defense with the necessary authority to better manage its programs and resources.

LAND ACQUISITION

Section 2181 would modify section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the authority of the Secretary of Defense to acquire lands without specific statutory authority from $100,000 to $400,000 with notice to the appropriate committees and 21 day wait.

OCCUPANT LIABILITY

Section 2182 would modify section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, concerning an occupant's liability for damage to family housing units to encourage the cleaning of housing by occupants when vacating the unit.

UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Section 2183 would modify section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, concerning unspecified minor construction projects. This modification would permit reprogramming into the minor construction account. As previously discussed, the committee expects to see these and all other reprogramming requests in the military construction account.

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Section 2184 is a technical change which will codify provisions of the annual military construction authorization bill concerning family housing construction support.

PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS

Section 2185 would modify section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, to provide the authority to pay preoccupancy termination costs under family housing build/lease agreements.

LEASING AND RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Section 2186 would modify section 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code, concerning leasing of family housing units. The modification would extend this authority one year and eliminate the limitations on the number of agreements and units. Section 2186 would also modify section 802 of the fiscal year 1984 Military Construction Authorization Act, concerning the family housing rental guarantee program. The modification eliminates the limitations on the number of agreements and units and extends authority for one year.

PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOUSING POOLS

Section 2187 would allow the Department of Defense to participate in Department of State (DOS) housing pools at DOS-specified locations. Participation is an alternative to existing family housing leasing programs.

SALE AND REPLACEMENT OF NONEXCESS REAL PROPERTY

Section 2188 would amend section 805 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984, concerning the Sale and Replacement of Non-Excess Real Property by extending the sunset date to October 1, 1986. This provision also authorizes two transactions in the fiscal year 1986 program. One is for warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, and the other is for an NCO professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

Two projects in the Department of Defense request were associated with the President's Executive Order 12348, dated February 25, 1982, which is aimed at improving the Government's management of real property by selling surplus Federal properties and using the proceeds to reduce the national debt. In implementing that order, the administration has adopted a concomitant policy of requiring one Federal agency to pay for property it desires to acquire from another Federal agnecy, including land transfers between two military services. In line with this policy, the National Defense University requested $4.2 million to acquire from the General Services Administration [GSA] 10.5 acres of surplus land adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia for a new university headquarters and library. The Air Force requested $1.8 million to buy 50 acres of federally held land for a new housing site near Fort MacArthur, CA. The committee is concerned with the policy of charging one Federal agency for unused properties of another. Such a practice inflates the budget of the acquiring agency and does nothing to reduce the deficit. If the purpose of the policy is to force Federal agencies to acquire only those real properties they absolutely need, the objective can and should be achieved through good management review within the executive branch.

Therefore, the committee denied both requests to purchase the properties. However, section 2189 directs the Administrator of General Services to transfer without reimbursement both the 10.5 acres of surplus property at Fort McNair to the Secretary of the Army and the 50 acres of federally owned land near Fort MacArthur, CA, to the Secretary of the Air Force.

SALE OF REAL PROPERTY AT FORT JACKSON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Section 2190 permits sale of property at Fort Jackson known as the Gregg Circle area with the requirement that the buyer provide 400 units of leased family housing and 100 mobile trailer home sites.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

Section 2191 provides that none of the funds authorized for projects in this act shall be made available for any project for which all requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 [NEPA] have not been completed as of March 29, 1985, unless the Secretary of Defense or appropriate Service Secretary has certified that the requirements of NEPA have been met.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND AT MARCH AIR FORCE BASE, CALIFORNIA

Section 2192 modifies section 835 of Public Law 98-407 which originally authorized the Air Force to convey, for fair market value, 150 acres of March Air Force Base to the Village West Foundation. The purpose is to provide an Air Force "Widows' Home" in California similar to the one at San Antonio, TX. The modification changes the name of "Village West" to avoid confusion. In addition, a new provision will allow Air Force Village West to use the land conveyed as security for financing the construction of the facilities.

AVIGATION RIGHTS ON SANTA ROSE ISLAND, FL

In 1948, Congress approved legislation (Public Law 885, 62 stat. 1229) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, FL, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island. Subsection d of section 1 of that act reserved for the United States an avigation easement in perpetuity, prohibiting the erection of any structure or obstacle in excess of 75 feet above mean low-water levels within the area to be conveyed. Section 2193 amends that 1948 act to raise the avigation restriction from 75 feet to 200 feet above mean low-water level over that portion of land on Santa Rose Island which is east of Destin East Pass and is now known as Holiday Isle. According to information made available to the committee from the Air Force, raising the avigation restriction from 75 feet to 200 feet will not severely impact radar coverage or approaches to Elgin Air Force Base. Since structures of similar height have already been erected on land not subject to the statutory height restriction, the Air

Force had no objection to the enactment of legislation to raise the height restriction for this portion of property only.

The committee has therefore included this proposal in its recommendation.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF NUCLEAR ENERGY AUTHORIZATION

PURPOSE OF THIS TITLE

Division C provides authority for appropriations to the Secretary of Energy for the operating expenses, capital equipment, and construction costs related to the National Defense Programs of the Department of Energy.

BACKGROUND

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Public Law 95-91, enacted on August 4, 1977 established the Department of Energy. The national security functions relating to the management and implementation of the nuclear weapons program and other national security activities involving nuclear weapons research and development were transferred from the Energy Research and Development Agency to the Department of Energy. These are essentially the same national security functions formerly accomplished by the Atomic Energy Commission.

SENATE JURISDICTION OVER NUCLEAR ENERGY MATTERS

Committee jurisdiction over all nuclear energy matters was exercised by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1946 to 1977. Following the adoption of Senate Resolution 4 on February 4, 1977, the Joint Committee was abolished and jurisdiction was divided between the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The Committee on Armed Services was given jurisdiction over national defense programs and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was given jurisdiction over the remainder of the activities of the Department of Energy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

National Defense Programs of the Department of Energy involve research and development, testing, production, and maintenance of the nuclear weapons that are the heart of our nuclear deterrent. The Department of Energy has seven programs with national security objectives as follows:

(1) Naval reactors development,
(2) Weapons activities,
(3) Verification and control technology,
(4) Materials production,
(5) Defense waste and byproducts management,
(6) Nuclear security and safeguards, and

(7) Security investigations.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

S. 911 was referred to the Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee for recommendation to the full Committee. The subcommittee held hearings on the bill on March 14, 1985 and received testimony from Mr. William W. Hoover, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs; Dr. Richard L. Wagner, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy); Dr. Roger E. Batzel, Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; Dr. George C. Dacey, President, Sandia National Laboratories, and Dr. Donald M. Kerr, Jr., Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory.

AUTHORIZATION RECOMMENDED

The authorizations recommended for fiscal year 1986 are shown in the table below:

SUMMARY OF CHANGES - FISCAL YEAR 1986 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROGRAMS

(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
SEC. 101, OPERATING EXPENSES			
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT			
PLANT DEVELOPMENT	66.00		66.00
REACTOR DEVELOPMENT	261.30		261.30
REACTOR OPERATION	150.00		150.00
PROGRAM DIRECTION	11.70		11.70
SUBTOTAL	489.00	0.00	489.00
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	920.30	75.00	995.30
TESTING	544.00	-20.00	524.00
PRODUCTION AND SURVEILLANCE	1,942.40	-80.00	1,862.40
PROGRAM DIRECTION	98.70		98.70
SUBTOTAL	3,505.40	-25.00	3,480.40
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY			
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	79.68	10.00	89.68
PROGRAM DIRECTION	3.80		3.80
SUBTOTAL	83.48	10.00	93.48
MATERIALS PRODUCTION			
URANIUM ENRICHING	258.90	-45.00	213.90
REACTOR OPERATIONS	586.38	-5.00	581.38
PROCESSING	493.14	-2.00	491.14
SUPPORTING SERVICES	256.57		256.57
PROGRAM DIRECTION	21.30		21.30
SUBTOTAL	1,616.30	-52.00	1,564.30
DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCTS MGMT			
INTERIM WASTE MANAGEMENT	281.08		281.08
LONG-TERM WASTE MGMT TECH	96.57		96.57
TERMINAL STORAGE	25.07		25.07
PROGRAM DIRECTION	2.40		2.40
SUBTOTAL	405.12	0.00	405.12
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS & SECURITY			
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS & SECURITY	47.40		47.40
PROGRAM DIRECTION	6.93		6.93
SUBTOTAL	54.32	0.00	54.32
SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS	33.40	0.00	33.40
TOTAL, OPERATING EXPENSES	6,187.02	-67.00	6,120.02

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
SEC. 102, PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT			
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT			
86-N-101, GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS, VL	7.50		7.50
86-N-104, REACTOR MODIFICATION ADVANCE TEST REACTOR, INEL	4.50		4.50
82-N-111, MATLS FAC, SR	11.00		11.00
81-T-112, MODS TO PROTOTYPES, VL	27.00		27.00
SUBTOTAL	50.00	0.00	50.00
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
86-D-101, GPP, VL	29.90		29.90
86-D-121, GPP, VL	33.70		33.70
86-D-103, DECON AND WASTE TREAT FAC, LLNL	1.00	2.70	3.70
86-D-104, STRATEGIC DEFENSES FAC, SNL	8.00		8.00
86-D-122, STRUCTURAL UPGR, PU FAC, ROCKY FLATS	3.00		3.00
86-D-123, ENV HAZARDS ELIMINATION, VL	8.70		8.70
86-D-124, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGR, PHASE II, MOUND	3.00		3.00
86-D-124, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGR, PHASE II, PANTEX	1.50		1.50
86-D-130, TRITIUM LOADING FAC RPLCMT, SR	5.00		5.00
86-D-131, ENVIRON REMED ACT, LL	0.00	8.80	8.80
86-D-132, INSTR SYSTEMS LAB, SNL	0.00	6.20	6.20
86-D-133, DATA COMM CTR, LA	0.00	3.00	3.00
86-D-102, NUC WPNS RD&T FAC REVITALIZATION PHASE I, VL	81.60	-6.60	75.00
85-D-103, SAFEGUARDS & SECURITY ENHANCEMENT LLNL AND SNL-LIVERMORE	27.90	-11.50	16.40
85-D-105, COMB DEV ASSEMBLY FAC, NTS	45.40	-16.20	29.20
85-D-106, HARDENED ENG TEST BLDG, LLNL	1.90		1.90
85-D-112, ENR U RECOVERY IMPR, Y-12	15.30		15.30
85-D-113, PWR PLT & STM DST SYS PANTEX	18.50		18.50
85-D-115, RENOVATE PU BLDG UTILITY SYSTEMS, ROCKY FLATS	17.70		17.70
85-D-121, AIR & WATER POL CNTRL FAC, Y-12	14.00		14.00
85-D-123, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGRADE, PHASE I, PANTEX	4.00		4.00
85-D-123, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGRADE, ROCKY FLATS	2.40		2.40
85-D-125, TACTICAL BOMB PROD FAC, VL	11.00	-2.00	9.00
84-D-102, RADIATION-HARDENED INTEGRATE CIRCUIT LAB, SNL-A	15.50		15.50
84-D-104, NUC MATLS STORAGE FAC, LANL	12.10		12.10
84-D-107, NUC TST FAC REVIT, VL	30.54	-5.00	25.54
84-D-112, TRIDENT II PRODUCTION FAC, VL	60.70		60.70
84-D-113, ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE/ STANDOFF WEAPON WARHEAD PROD FAC, VD	16.00	-16.00	0.00
84-D-115, ELEC SYS EXP, PANTEX	3.30		3.30
84-D-117, INERT ASSEMBLY & TEST FAC, PANTEX	0.40		0.40
84-D-118, HIGH-EXP SUBASSEMBLY FAC, PANTEX	40.00	-10.00	30.00
84-D-120, EXPLOSIVE COMP TEST FAC, MOUND	2.30		2.30
84-D-211, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGRADE, Y-12	7.50		7.50

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
84-D-211, SAFEGUARDS & SITE SECURITY UPGRADE, PINELLAS	3.80		3.80
83-D-119, BUFFER LAND ACQUISITION LLNL AND SNL-L	17.00	-7.00	10.00
82-D-107, UTILITIES ADN EQUIP RESTORATION REPLACEMENT, AND UPGR, PHASE III, VL	195.50	-25.50	170.00
82-D-111, INTERACTIVE GRAPHICS SYS, VL	6.00		6.00
82-D-144, SIMULATION TECH LAB, SNL-A	10.30		10.30
79-7-0, UNIVERSAL PILOT PLANT, PANTEX	4.50		4.50
SUBTOTAL	758.94	-79.10	679.84
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY			
85-D-171, SPACE SCIENCE LAB, LANL	4.50		4.50
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY			
86-D-186, NUC SAFEGUARDS TECH LAB, LLNL	1.00		1.00
MATERIELS PRODUCTION			
86-D-146, GPP, VL	34.80	-2.00	32.80
86-D-149, PROD RETEN PROG, PHASE I, VL	27.20	-1.00	26.20
86-D-150, IN-CORE NEUTRON MONITORING SYSTEM, N REACTOR, RL	5.46		5.46
86-D-151, PUREX ELEC SYSTEM UPGRADE, RL	3.50		3.50
86-D-152, REACTOR ELEC DIST SYSTEM, SR	4.00		4.00
86-D-153, ADDITIONAL LINE III FURNACE, SR	2.00		2.00
86-D-154, EFFLUENT TREATMENT FAC, SR	2.50		2.50
86-D-156, PLANTWIDE SAFEGUARDS SYS, SR	3.00		3.00
86-D-157, HYDROFLUORINATION SYSTEM FB-LINE, SR	2.20		2.20
85-D-135, VAULT SAFETY SNM INVENTORY SYSTEM, RL	1.90		1.90
85-D-139, FUEL RPOCESSING RESTORATION IFP, FAC, INEL	15.00		15.00
85-D-140, PRODUCTIVITY & RADIOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS, FMPC, FERNALD	12.00		12.00
85-D-145, FUEL PRODUCTION FAC, SR	16.00		16.00
84-D-135, PROCESS FAC MODS, RL	15.00		15.00
84-D-136, ENR U CONV FAC MODS, Y-12	7.20		7.20
83-D-148, NONRADIOACTIVE HAZARDOUS WASTE	3.10		3.10
82-D-124, RESTORATION OF PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES, PHASES, II-VI	48.90	-3.00	45.90
82-D-201, SPECIAL PU RECOVERY FAC, JB-LINE, SR	4.40		4.40
SUBTOTAL	208.16	-6.00	202.16
DEFENSE WASTE & BYPRODUCTS MANAGEMEMT			
86-D-171, GPP, INTERIM WASTE OPERATIONS AND LONG-TERM WASTE MGMT TECH, VL	26.45	-1.00	25.45
86-D-172, B PLANT F FILTER, RL	1.00		1.00
86-D-173, CENTRAL WASTE DISPOSAL FAC, OAK RIDGE	1.00		1.00
86-D-174, LOW-LEVEL WASTE PROC SHIPPING SYSTEM, FEED MATLS PROD CNTR, FERNALD	2.50		2.50
86-D-175, INEL SECURITY UPGRADE	2.00		2.00

PROGRAM	FISCAL YEAR 1986 REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
85-D-157, SEVENTH CALCINED SOLIDS STORAGE FAC, ICPP, INEL	14.50		14.50
85-D-158, CENTRAL WAREHOUSE UPGR, RL	5.00		5.00
85-D-159, NEW WASTE TRANS FAC, H-AREA, SR	9.00		9.00
85-D-160, TEST REACTOR AREA SECURITY SYSTEM UPGRADE, INEL	2.25		2.25
81-T-105, DEFENSE WASTE PROC FAC, SR	205.00	-40.00	165.00
SUBTOTAL	268.70	-41.00	227.70
TOTAL, PLANT CONSTRUCTION	1,291.30	-126.10	1,165.20
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	277.75	-5.00	272.75
MATERIALS PRODUCTION	123.44	-5.00	118.44
DEFENSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCTS MGMT	39.00		39.00
VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	5.60		5.60
NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY	4.60		4.60
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT	30.00		30.00
TOTAL, CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	480.39	-10.00	470.39
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	7,958.71	-203.10	7,755.61

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

Program Description

The Naval Reactors Development program is an integrated effort involving the design, development, improvement, testing, evaluation, and disposition of naval nuclear propulsion reactor plant components and cores. The objective is to enhance the performance, reliability, and safety of naval reactors while simplifying plant operating and maintenance requirements; and to design and develop advanced reactors for use in improving the capability of present and future nuclear powered naval warships.

For fiscal year 1986, the Naval Reactors Development program budget request is $489.0 million.

Committee Action

The committee approved these programs as requested.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Program Description

The weapons program budget provides for essential effort required to support the development, testing, production, and lifetime surveillance of safe and reliable nuclear weapons to meet national defense needs. A related effort involving research in inertial fusion is required for work relevant to weapons research, particularly with respect to laboratory scale investigations of certain phenomena pertinent to weapons physics. Research, development and testing activities in fiscal year 1986 will be pursued in support of weaponization and to assure advancement in nuclear weapons technology, including the Strategic Defense Initiative. $920.3 million is requested for this purpose.

The testing budget will support nuclear device tests in fiscal year 1986 and allow for the preparation required to support the testing effort in future years. The level of testing effort will support tests related to the weaponization effort in the laboratories and tests for effort related to future requirements. Emphasis will be placed upon obtaining experimental information in the most cost effective manner. $544.0 million is requested for this purpose.

The budget request deletes the inertial confinement fusion program as a separate line item under the weapons program, and includes a much reduced inertial fusion effort under the research and development program. The level of funding for ICF is reduced by about $85 million, a decrease of 55% relative to the fiscal year 1985 funding level for this purpose. There is also a corresponding decrease of 55% in the level of manning associated with this effort.

The budget also provides for the production of new nuclear weapons for the stockpile and for the surveillance and maintenance of existing stockpile weapons as approved by the President. $1,942.4 million is requested for this purpose. Included are the full scale production of the B61-3 and -4 bombs, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W79 warhead for the Artillery Fired Atomic Projectile, the W80-0 warhead for the Sea Launched Cruise Missile, the W80-1 warhead for the Air Launched Cruise Missile, the B83 Strategic Bomb, the W84 warhead for the Ground Launched Cruise Missile, and the W85 warhead for the Pershing II.

COMMITTEE ACTION

OPERATING EXPENSES

Research and development.—The committee directs the reinstatement of the inertial confinement fusion line item under the "weapons activities" program. Inertial confinement fusion (ICF) is a research and development program directed toward demonstrating the feasibility of burning very small masses of thermonuclear fuel through the use of lasers or particle beam generators. Understanding of the physics of small fuel mass burn can assist the nuclear weapons research, development, and testing activity by providing measurements of material properties at very high densities and temperatures; data on processes occurring during the implosion of fuel masses; and simulation of some nuclear weapons effects. If sufficiently small fuel masses can be ignited using laser or particle beams, inertial fusion may also have the potential of being, in the long term, a means of commercial power production if cost effective drivers can be developed.

The committee has strongly supported the national inertial confinement fusion program for almost a decade, with cumulative appropriations of more than $1.8 billion, because of the significant technical contributions the program has made to the understanding of nuclear weapons physics, nuclear weapon radiation effects, directed energy weapon efforts, and for its potential contribution in the long term to fusion energy production. In addition, the committee believes that the existence of significant programs at the nuclear weapon laboratories that push the leading edge of both science and technology and are closely related and useful to the national nuclear weapons program are both beneficial and essential in maintaining the overall viability and technical excellence of these institutions over the long term.

The committee does not believe that the proposed reduction in the program is prudent at this time for two reasons. First, a reduction in the level of dedicated scientific teams at the various laboratories at a time when the systems are transitioning from construction to operation would deny the system the capability to produce the useful scientific data for which they were designed. Second, such action prejudges the outcome of the ongoing review of the program by a Technical Review Group set up by the President in accordance with the fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization Act. It is the hope of the committee that this group can assess the merits of the ICF program, and lay out a program for future work that can lead to future program stability.

The committee further directs that $155.0 million dollars be identified for an inertial confinement fusion program element, $80.0 million of which shall come from the research and development account, and $75.0 million from an increase to the research and development account that is recommended by the committee. This represents a net reduction of $10.0 million dollars in non-ICF related activities. Of the amount recommended, $15 million should be allocated to KMS Fusion, Inc., for operating expenses related to ICF research in support of the National Laboratories. The committee also directs that $14.6 million of the capital equipment account for weapons activities be applied to ICF related activities, including $4.6 million for upgrades to laser equipments at KMS Fusion, Inc.

The committee has recommended an increase to $10.0 million in the Defense Department's budget request for a cooperative research effort with the DOE labs in the area of conventional munitions. The committee believes that the talent and the analytical capability at the DOE labs can bring a new dimension to DOD conventional munitions R&D. To supplement this DOD funding, the committee directs that the Secretary of Energy earmark a matching $10 million from funds authorized in this account to enable high priority conventional munitions efforts with potential for early payoff to be accelerated.

Testing.—Due to budget constraints, the committee has reduced the account for nuclear weapons testing by $20.0 million. The committee recognizes that this action may reduce the number of possible tests for fiscal year 1985 by one; however, the committee believes that by increasing the number of experiments accomplished with each test, as the department is doing, this reduction can be accommodated without major impact.

Production and surveillance.—The committee again defers action relating to the SM-2 and the advanced ASW warheads. In accordance with this action, and in recognition of budget constraints the committee recommends an $80.0 million reduction in this account.

Program direction.—The committee approves this item as requested.

CONSTRUCTION

Under the construction heading, unless otherwise discussed herein, the committee has deferred certain construction projects as shown in the above table solely for budgetary reasons.

Project 84-D-113 is deferred in consonance with the committee action to delay production of the associated warhead. Project 85-D-125 relating to tactical bomb production facilities is reduced pending a reassessment of our tactical nuclear bomb requirements.

The committee recommends three programs that were not included in the Department's budget request. The first is an "Environmental Remedial Action" to provide funding to accomplish the most pressing environmental assessments and remedial actions at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The committee recommends that the $8.8 million required for this project in fiscal year 1986 be offset from project 85-D-103. The second is an Instrumentation Systems Laboratory at the Sandia National Laboratory that would be used in part to further verification research. The $6.2 million required for this project is offset by recommended reductions in the Weapons Lab Building and the Process Development Lab projects in 85-D-102. The third is a Data Communications Center at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, for which $3.0 million is approved without offset.

In the case of project 86-D-103, a new project relating to a waste treatment facility, the committee recommends an increase of $2.7

million to begin the lengthy permiting process and thus keep the project on schedule.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

Program Description

The Verification and Control Technology program supports U.S. national security and foreign policy development and execution in the areas of treaty verification, intelligence, arms control and export control as they relate to nuclear weapons issues. This program can be divided into the categories of detection technology and analytical support. $83.475 million is requested for this purpose.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In view of the significant potential of certain verification technologies to the furthering of our arms control and national security interests, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million dollars for this program at all budget levels.

Material Production

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Materials Production program provides nuclear materials to meet the near term national defense and non-defense requirements and to sustain a base production program capable of meeting long term nuclear materials requirements consistent with the annual Presidential Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum and the annual Department of Energy Materials Management Plan. $1,616.3 million is requested for this purpose.

Committee Action

OPERATING EXPENSES

Due to budget constraints, the committee recommends a reduction in the materials production account of $52.0 million of which $45.0 million is for uranium enriching. The proposed reduction for uranium enriching includes deletion of $32 million associated with work in process charges.

The committee has consistently supported the Plasma Separation Process Development Program and expects that sufficient funding to keep this effort on a schedule compatible with future needs will be made available within the "Supporting Services" category of the Materials Production program.

CONSTRUCTION

Adjustments to construction projects in support of materials production are listed in the table above, and are recommended for budgetary considerations only.

CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

The $5.0 million reduction listed for materials production capital equipment is recommended for budgetary considerations only.

DEFNSE WASTE AND BYPRODUCT MANAGEMENT

Program Description

The goal of the Defense Waste and Byproducts Management program is to provide for safe interim storage or utilization of radioactive waste and byproducts generated primarily from nuclear materials production and naval propulsion while continuing the development of technologies and facilities for the final disposal of defense waste. $405.122 million is requested for this purpose.

Committee Action

The committee recommends full funding for the operating expenses and capital equipment requested for this program. The reductions recommended in construction projects are for budgetary reasons only.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

Program Description

The Nuclear Safeguards and Security program is responsible for developing measures to assure adequate protection of DOE's nuclear weapons, nuclear materials, facilities, and classified information against theft and sabotage. The program also focuses on providing safeguards technical support to U.S. and international activities designed to minimize the proliferation of nuclear weapons. As part of this program, the classification activity is responsible for implementing the DOE's classification and declassification activities. $54.325 million is requested for this purpose.

Committee Action

In keeping with the committee's long standing concern with the security and safeguards at all DOE production and manufacturing facilities, the full amount requested is recommended for authorization.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

Program Description

The objective of the Security Investigations program is to insure that the common defense and security of the United States is protected by an adequate background investigation and screening of those DOE and DOE contractor personnel who would, in the performance of their work, need access to classified data or who would occupy a designated Critical Sensitive position. The Office of Safeguards and Security is responsible for this activity. $33.4 million is requested for this purpose.

Committee Action

The committee recommends full funding of the request for this purpose.

DIVISION D—CIVIL DEFENSE

CIVIL DEFENSE FEMA PROCUREMENT

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year 1986 request		Recommendation		Change	
	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
Procurement		119.125		119.125		0

The administration requested $119.125 million for the nation's civil defense preparedness program in fiscal year 1986, a decrease of one-third over the funding level approved in fiscal year 1985.

The reduced levels reflect budget constraints, as well as the administration's recognition of the need for a thorough and extensive review of our national civil defense objectives, policies and programs.

The committee recommends funding the full amount as requested, and directs that the committee be kept advised as to the progress and direction of the reassessment of our civil defense needs, especially as they relate to the Strategic Defense Initiative Program. Also, the Committee recommends that priority be given to continuation of the Telcommunications and Warning Systems Modernization effort initiated in fiscal year 1985.

FISCAL YEAR 1986 CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

[Budget authority in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1985 approved	Fiscal year 1986 request
Emergency Management Planning and Assistance:		
State and local emergency management	58.000	51.300
Radiological defense	10.274	6.274
Population protection	12.948	6.148
Protection of industrial capability	1.500	0
State and local direction, control, and warning	12.056	.681
Research	2.287	.487
Training and education	14.918	8.528
Telecommunications and warning	32.339	15.900
Salaries and expenses	32.832	29.807
Total	177.954	119.125

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, DC, March 7, 1985.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith legislation, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

In accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, we are also submitting herewith, as separate legislation, a similar request for authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1987.

These proposals are part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 99th Congress and the Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of these proposals would be in accord with the program of the President.

Title I provides procurement authorization for the military departments and for the Defense agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986. It contains a provision that extends for fiscal year 1986 the authority to waive certain costs in connection with the NATO AWACS program.

Title II provides for the authorization of each of the research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations for the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986.

Title III provides for authorization of the operation and maintenance appropriations of the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986. The authorization includes a provision that authorizes the appropriation of funds that are necessary to cover unbudgeted increases in fuel costs, and unbudgeted inflation in the cost of activities covered by title III.

Title IV provides for the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of providing capital for working-capital funds of the military departments and the Defense Agencies in amounts equal to the budget authority included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986.

Title V prescribes the end strengths for active duty personnel in each component of the Armed Forces as required by section 138(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided by the budget authority and appropriations requested for these components for fiscal year 1986.

Title VI provides for average strengths of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces as required by section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for by the budget authority and appropriations requested for the Department of Defense in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986. Title VI also prescribes the end strengths for reserve component members on full-time active duty of full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of administering the reserve forces and provides for an increase in the number of certain enlisted and commissioned personnel who may be serving on active duty in support of the reserve components.

Title VII provides that the provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to the authorization of a civilian personnel end strength for the Department of Defense shall not be applicable with respect to fiscal year 1986.

Title VIII provides for the average military training student loads as required by section 138(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, in the numbers provided for this purpose in the President's budget for fiscal year 1986.

Title IX consists of four general provisions. Section 901 amends section 2208(j) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the industrial fund asset capitalization program by deleting the provisions requiring the use of not less than 4 percent and 5 percent of the payments received by industrial funds during fiscal years 1986 and 1987, respectively, for acquisition of capital equipment for industrial fund activities. Section 902 amends parts of the Department of Education Organization Act relating to the transfer of Defense Dependents' Education System to the Department of Education. Section 903 amends section 138(g) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the size of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund to increase it from $900,000,000 to $1,000,000,000. Section 904 repeals subsection 1002(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 which imposes a limitation of 326,414 on the number of personnel who may be assigned ashore in Europe.

Sincerely,

CHAPMAN B. COX.

Enclosures.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

For aircraft, $3,892,500,000.

For missiles, $3,386,700,000.

For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $5,739,100,000.

For ammunition, $2,635,000,000.

For other procurement, $5,712,800,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Sec. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy as follows:

For aircraft, $12,062,600,000.

For weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), $5,627,900,000.

For shipbuilding and conversion, $11,411,600,000.

For other procurement, $6,601,200,000.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons) in the amount of $1,726,800,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

Sec. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

For aircraft, $26,165,500,000.

For missiles, $10,862,700,000.

For other procurement, $9,538,000,000.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

Sec. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the Defense Agencies in the amount of $1,391,900,000.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

Sec. 105. Effective on October 1, 1985, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1985" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1986".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $5,279,900,000.

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $11,265,900,000.

For the Air Force, $15,578,500,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $7,157,900,000, of which $103,500,000 is authorized for the activities of the Director of Test and Evaluation, Defense.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $20,190,630,000.

For the Navy, $25,797,700,000.

For the Marine Corps, $1,667,400,000.

For the Air Force, $20,924,400,000.

For the Defense Agencies, $7,568,900,000.

For the Army Reserve, $779,600,000.

For the Naval Reserve, $954,500,000.

For the Marine Corps Reserve, $61,600,000.

For the Air Force Reserve, $907,700,000.

For the Army National Guard, $1,605,200,000.

For the Air National Guard, $1,830,100,000.

For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, $920,000.

For Defense Claims, $158,300,000.

For the Court of Military Appeals, $3,200,000.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(2) for unbudgeted increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds, in amounts as follows:

For the Army Stock Fund, $442,000,000.

For the Navy Stock Fund, $716,500,000.

For the Marine Corps Stock Fund, $42,700,000.

For the Air Force Stock Fund, $464,900,000.

For the Defense Stock Fund, $193,500,000.

TITLE V—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 501. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1986, as follows:

(1) The Army, 780,800.

(2) The Navy, 586,300.

(3) The Marine Corps, 199,500.

(4) The Air Force, 611,500.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 601. (a) For fiscal year 1986 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programmed to attain average strengths of not less than the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 444,000.
(2) The Army Reserve, 291,900.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 134,400.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 41,900.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 108,700.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 75,600.
(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 12,500.

(b) The average strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 602. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 601, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1986, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 30,679.
(2) The Army Reserve, 14,714.
(3) The Naval Reserve, 19,510.
(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 1,475.
(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 7,269.
(6) The Air Force Reserve, 635.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

SEC. 603. (a) The table in section 517(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	517	175	80	9
E-8	2,296	381	358	74".

(b) The table in section 524(a) of such title is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutenant Commander	2,476	875	476	100
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	1,240	520	318	60
Colonel or Navy Captain	360	177	189	25".

(b) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 701. The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1986 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 801. (a) For fiscal year 1986, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:

(1) The Army, 79,686.
(2) The Navy, 71,018.
(3) The Marine Corps, 20,766.
(4) The Air Force, 43,389.
(5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 18,886.
(6) The Army Reserve, 16,985.
(7) The Naval Reserve, 3,355.
(8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 3,790.
(9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,517.
(10) The Air Force Reserve, 2,352.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1986 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V and VI of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

INDUSTRIAL FUND CAPITALIZATION PROGRAM

SEC. 901. Section 2208(j) of title 10, United States Code is amended by striking out “, not less than 4 percent during fiscal year 1986, and not less than 5 percent during fiscal year 1987”

CONTINUED OPERATION BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE OF THE DEFENSE DEPENDENTS’ EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 901. (a)(1) Sections 208 and 302, subsection (e) of section 202 and subsection (f) of section 401 of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.A.C. 3418, 3442, 3412(e) and 3461(f)) are repealed.

(2) Section 419(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3478(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out “(1)” after the subsection designation “(a)”, and

(B) by striking out paragraph (2).

(3) Section 503(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3503(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out “(1)” after the subsection designation “(a)”, and

(B) by striking out clause (2).

(4) The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by striking out the items relating to sections 208 and 302.

(5) Section 414(b) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 3474(b)) is amended by striking out “302”.

(6) Section 508(f) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 5316) is amended by striking out “(38) Administrator of Education for Overseas Dependents, Department of Education”.

(b) Section 1402 of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921) is amended by inserting the following new subsection:

> “The Secretary of Defense, in his discretion, may request the Secretary of Education to provide information, advice and technical support concerning educational programs and practices.”.

(c) The second sentence of section 1410(b) of the Defense Dependents’ Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 928(b)) is amended by striking out “The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense” and inserting in lieu thereof “The Secretary of Defense”.

(d) Section 1411(a)) of the Department of Defense Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 929(a)0 is amended to read as follows:

> “(a) There is established in the Department of Defense an Advisory Council on Dependents’ Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ‘Council’). The Council shall be composed of—
>
> “(1) the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Logistics (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ‘Assistant Secretary’), who shall be the chairman of the Council;
>
> “(2) twelve individuals appointed by the Assistant Secretary, who shall be individuals who have demonstrated an interest in the field of primary or secondary education and who shall include representatives of professional employee organizations, school administrators, and sponsors of students enrolled in the

defense dependents' education system, and one student enrolled in such system.

"(3) representatives from overseas military commands and from educational institutions as designated by the Assistant Secretary; and

"(4) one individual appointed by the Secretary of Education.

The Director shall be the Executive Secretary of the Council".

(e) Section 1411(b)(1) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 929(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "Secretary of Education" and inserting in lieu thereof "Assistant Secretary".

(f) Section 1411(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 929(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "at least four times each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "not more than four times each year";

(2) by striking out clause (2):

(3) by redesignating clauses (3), (4), and (5) as clauses (2), (3), and (4), respectively; and

(4) by striking out "Secretary of Education" in clause (4) (as redesignated in clause (3) of this subsection) and inserting in lieu thereof "Assistant Secretary".

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND

SEC. 903. Section 138(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The size of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund established pursuant to chapter 5 of the Arms Export Control Act may not exceed $1,000,000,000."

REPEAL OF EUROPEAN TROOP STRENGTH LIMITATION

SEC. 904. Section 1002 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985, is amended by repealing subsection (c) and by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal years for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987".

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons, and tracked combat vehicles, and ammunition and for other procurement for the Army.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

SEC. 102. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), shipbuilding and conversion, and other procurement for the Navy.

(b) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for the Defense Agencies in such amounts as may be necessary.

CERTAIN AUTHORITY PROVIDED THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATO AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS) PROGRAM

SEC. 105. Effective on October 1, 1986, section 103(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-86; 95 Stat. 1100) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1986" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1987".

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 301. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), such sums as may be necessary—

(1) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(2) for unbudgeted increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

TITLE IV—WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 such amounts as may be necessary for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working-capital funds.

TITLE V—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 501. The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1987, in such numbers as may be necessary.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE

SEC. 601. (a) For fiscal year 1987 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programmed to attain an average strength as may be necessary.

(b) The average strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES

SEC. 602. (a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 601, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1987, such number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components as may be necessary.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

TITLE VII—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH

SEC. 701. The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1987 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

TITLE VIII—STUDENT TRAINING LOADS

AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 801. (a) For fiscal year 1987, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as may be necessary.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1987 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V, and VI of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, DC., February 14, 1985.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations for Fiscal Year 1986, and for other purposes." This legislation is consistent with the Budget of the United States for Fiscal Year 1986. Appropriations in support of Titles I through IX of this legislation are discussed in that Budget.

This proposal would authorize appropriations for new construction and family housing support for the Active Forces as follows: $3,649,674,000 for the Department of the Army, $2,886,249,000 for the Department of the Navy, $2,917,048,000 for the Department of the Air Force, and $329,900,000 for the Defense Agencies. Included in Title I is authorization for construction of production base support at Army Ammunition Facilities. Title V would authorize $98,000,000 for the United States' share of the NATO Infrastructure Program. Title VII, totaling $428,600,000 would authorize appropriations for construction for the Guard and Reserve Forces.

In addition to the authorizations for appropriations, title VI contains recurring administrative provisions applicable to the Military Construction Program in accordance with chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. Title VIII provides authorization for Fiscal Year 1987 to meet the basic requirements of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law No. 93-344) and a provision to repeal Section 2859 of title 10, United States Code.

The projects that would be authorized by this proposal have been reviewed to determine if environmental impact statements are required by Public Law No. 91-190; required environmental statements will be submitted to the Congress by the Military Departments.

Sincerely,

L. Niederlehner, *Acting.*

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of th United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986".

TITLE I—ARMY

AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property, carry out military construction projects, and construct or acquire family housing units and facilities in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Various, United States, $3,000,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $64,317,000, including 50 mobile home spaces, and acquisition of 2 family housing units by reconfiguration.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $33,219,000, including 50 mobile home spaces.

Fort Carson, Colorado, $56,162,000, including 50 mobile home spaces.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $927,000, including 20 mobile home spaces.

Fort Drum, New York, $70,490,000, including 800 family housing units.

Fort Greely, Alaska, $2,500,000.

Fort Hood, Texas, $66,650,000.

Fort Hunter-Liggett, California, $11,100,000.

Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, $5,300,000.

Fort Irwin, California, $30,050,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington, $144,330,000.

Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, $940,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland, $18,930,000.

Fort Ord, California, $76,460,000, including 600 family housing units, and 70 mobile home spaces.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, $38,430,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska, $3,600,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas, $59,490,000, including 50 mobile home spaces.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $1,440,000.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $3,500,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, $35,953,000, including 20 mobile home spaces.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $14,000,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California, $2,650,000.

Yakima Firing Center, Washington, $16,430,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, $6,300,000.

Hawaii, Various, $510,000.

Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii, $2,150,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $31,950,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia, $6,450,000.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $31,000,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, $5,300,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $39,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $31,050,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $6,100,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $46,040,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina, $6,600,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $20,770,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $6,900,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $12,050,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $3,950,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $39,350,000.
Fort Pickett, Virginia, $420,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $9,450,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $52,000,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $1,950,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $8,896,000, including six family housing units.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $4,670,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $8,960,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, $924,000, including one family housing unit.
Corpus Christi Army Deport, Texas, $4,400,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $320,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $17,324,000, including 104 family housing units and 24 mobile home spaces.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $490,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $19,000,000.
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $1,550,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $240,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $88,000,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $1,000,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $19,000,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $200,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $820,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $25,750,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $29,000,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, $4,550,000.
Savanna Army Deport, Illinois, $510,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,410,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,970,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $11,490,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $260,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $240,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $1,670,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $210,000.

Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $810,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $570,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $930,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $640,000.
Newport Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $39,000,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,910,000.
Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $210,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INTELLIGNECE AND SECURITY COMMAND

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia, $6,850,000.

UNITES STATES ARMY INFORMTION COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $2,780,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $31,000,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado, $2,550,000.
Fort Detrick, Maryland, $7,600,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $970,000.
Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,150,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $3,200,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $330,000.
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $1,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Humphreys Engineer Center, Supt. Activity, Virginia, $17,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,050,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $44,880,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $12,920,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Colbern, Korea, $550,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,090,000.
Camp Gary Owen, Korea, $580,000.
Camp Giant, Korea, $1,050,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $420,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $1,980,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $11,600,000.
Camp Kittyhawk, Korea, $1,600,000.

Camp Kyle, Korea, $3,580,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $800,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $710,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $32,650,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,400,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,730,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $5,500,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $4,050,000.
Location 177, Korea, $2,290,000.
Yongin, Korea, $2,550,000.
Yongson, Korea, $9,800,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $14,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Panama, $7,680,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE AND SEVENTH ARMY

Amberg, Germany, $850,000.
Ansbach, Germany, $14,390,000.
Aschaffenburg, Germany, $750,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $1,100,000.
Bad Toelz, Germany, $1,850,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $13,699,000, including 106 family housing units.
Baumholder, Germany, $900,000.
Darmstadt, Germany, $29,200,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $18,680,000.
Fulda, Germany, $7,200,000.
Giessen, Germany, $12,050,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $10,250,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,450,000.
Haingruen, Germany, $680,000.
Hanau, Germany, $48,140,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $8,800,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,200,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $6,300,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $3,450,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $4,020,000.
Mainz, Germany, $820,000.
New Ulm, Germany, $110,000.
Nuernberg, Germany, $9,360,000.
Pirmasens, Germany, $14,000,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $17,840,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,500,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $37,120,000, including 370 family housing units.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $2,900,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $20,000,000.
Wobeck, Germany, $700,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $48,070,000.

Various Locations, Germany, 138 family housing units, $6,120,000.

Various Locations, Greece, $1,440,000.

Various Locations, Italy, $1,850,000.

Various Locations, Turkey, $7,440,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 102. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $166,000,000 of which $10,950,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2815(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit $99,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred sixty-four units, $4,712,000.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, eighty-one units, $2,762,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property, carry out military constructive projects, and construct or acquire family housing units and facilities in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $530,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $7,805,000.

Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California, $1,470,000.

Marine Corps Camp Detachment, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,995,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $24,140,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $173,175,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Camp Pendleton, California, $14,310,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $37,940,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $60,175,000, including 282 family housing units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $17,420,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $10,780,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $3,610,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $17,970,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $32,560,000, including 100 family housing units.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $7,060,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $16,750,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $1,775,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $2,990,000.

Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $2,250,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $28,900,000.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,940,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $23,480,000.

Naval Space Command, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,700,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $10,300,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, Lewisville, Arkansas, $675,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Mayport, Florida, $470,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, $13,000,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, North Island, California, $585,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,880,000.

Intelligence Center, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Commandant Naval District Washington, District of Columbia, $6,300,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,040,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $29,835,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $9,960,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $12,270,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $16,370,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $13,060,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $365,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $18,560,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,675,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $800,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $16,940,000.

Naval Facility, Radio Island, North Carolina, $17,640,000.

Naval Facility Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, $700,000.

Naval Facility Antigua, West Indies, $2,410,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $22,410,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $21,780,000.

Naval Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,100,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $14,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, $15,500,000, including 100 family housing units.

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $8,650,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $5,200,000.

Amphibious Task Force, Camp Pendleton, California, $9,020,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,150,000.

Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $17,640,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $36,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $2,300,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $17,230,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $385,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $18,593,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,180,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $17,042,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Station, Seattle, Washington, $3,480,000.

Naval Station Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $735,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines, $19,200,000.

Naval Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $16,530,000.

Naval Air Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $22,450,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, $11,270,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $6,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, $10,200,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, $990,000.

Naval Magazine, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $250,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $13,270,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,180,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, $9,330,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command Detachment, Coronado, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,360,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $9,640,000.

Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School, Eglin, Florida, $13,700,000.

Naval Training Center, Greak Lakes, Illinois, $20,740,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,460,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $420,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $14,875,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $450,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $13,300,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $28,280,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $225,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $5,670,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $7,850,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $305,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $4,750,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $2,900,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $1,570,000.

Fleet Training Group Pacific, Warner Springs, California, 44 family housing units, $4,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $810,000.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

Navy Band, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,900,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Medical Clinic, Annapolis, Maryland, $12,540,000.

Naval Hospital, Groton, Connecticut, $8,720,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida, $18,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, $6,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Oak Harbor, Washington, $13,900,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $7,250,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIAL

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $24,980,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, $30,945,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $1,520,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $4,070,000.

Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $1,720,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $9,315,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $19,120,000, including 200 family housing units.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,550,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $1,570,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,555,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $2,440,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $404,060,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst, New Jersey, $600,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $7,160,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, Kentucky, $16,950,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $13,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $2,350,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $9,465,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $7,890,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,860,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $13,700,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $8,430,000.

Naval Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one family housing unit, $170,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $10,200,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $23,650,000.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California, $10,780,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $3,255,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $6,690,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California, $27,450,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, 200 family housing units, $15,200,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $7,100,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, St. Inigoes, Maryland, $15,550,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, $815,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $4,220,000.

Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,120,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,080,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, 300 family housing units, $24,180,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Yokosuka, Japan, $4,400,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanography Command Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $390,000.

Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $4,500,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, $785,000.

Naval Communication Area Master Station Western Pacific, Guam, $8,945,000.

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,690,000.

Naval Communication Station, Rota, Spain, $395,000.

Naval Communication Station, Yokosuka, Japan, $21,490,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $980,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest, Chesapeake, Virginia, $1,385,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, $395,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $3,280,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $3,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $7,635,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, 7,750,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain, $1,030,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $5,930,000.

Personnel Support Activity, London, United Kingdom, $450,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various locations, $980,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

Sec. 202. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $34,020,000.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out a project to improve three hundred and seventy-two existing military family housing units at the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, in the amount of $17,610,000.

TRANSIENT HOUSING UNITS, CHINHAE, KOREA

Sec. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may convert the four existing transient housing units contained in Building 706 in Chinhae, Korea to family housing units.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

Sec. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property, carry out military construction projects, and construct or acquire family housing units and facilities in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $28,280,000.
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $41,699,000.
McClellan Air Force Base, California, $53,829,000.
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $7,350,000.
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $33,100,000.
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $21,890,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tennessee, $16,900,000.
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $2,500,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, California, $7,250,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $12,260,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $27,150,000.
Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,700,000.
Fort MacArthur, White Point, California, $1,800,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Billy Mitchell Field, Wisconsin, $500,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Buckley Air National Guard Base, Colorado, $12,370,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,730,000.
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $29,950,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $10,500,000
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $22,750,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $1,900,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $6,850,000.
Mather Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $3,200,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $3,250,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $16,150,000.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $660,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $660,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $6,000,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $8,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Attu Research Site, Alaska, $910,000.
Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $44,950,000.
Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $5,000,000.
King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $8,600,000.
Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $45,900,000.

MILITRY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $13,160,000.
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $10,120,000.
Base 24, Classified Location, $6,170,000.
Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, $12,250,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,620,000.
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, $19,190,000.
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $1,700,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $60,330,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $2,240,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $16,100,000.
Norton Air Force Base, California, $4,570,000.
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $440,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $9,350,000.
Travis Air Force Base, California, $10,300,000.
Lajes Field, Portugal, $25,285,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $13,600,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $480,000.
Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,050,000.
Camp Zama, Japan, $1,500,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, $27,650,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $9,500,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $13,750,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $10,400,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $9,000,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $16,310,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $25,710,000.
Sachon Air Base, Korea, $310,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $5,300,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $52,950,000, including 450 family housing units.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $600,000.
Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $950,000.
Clear Air Force Station, Alaska, $4,500,000.
Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $5,200,000.
Thule Air Base, Greenland, $12,350,000.
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,750,000.
GEODSS Site 5, Portugal, $14,650,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $2,600,000.
BMEWS Site III, Fylingdales, United Kingdom, $3,100,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $55,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $1,400,000.
Base 34, Classified Location, $8,920,000.

Beale Air Force Base, California, $6,950,000.

Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, $8,080,000, including 50 family housing units.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $3,750,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, $3,150,000.

Castle Air Force Base, California, $3,300,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $16,950,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $72,064,000.

F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $15,310,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $62,730,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $2,740,000.

Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $1,700,000.

K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $22,580,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,300,000.

March Air Force Base, California, $9,000,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $71,490,000.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $5,000,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $10,440,000.

Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $1,200,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $1,050,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,960,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,650,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $5,300,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $770,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, $12,500,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,230,000.

England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $4,900,000.

George Air Force Base, California, $20,240,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $16,850,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $7,015,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $8,680,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $14,780,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $10,150,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $24,030,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,600,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $430,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $23,860,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,320,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $13,300,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $8,780,000.

Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $23,172,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $10,310,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $35,060,000, including 400 family housing units.

Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany, $350,000.

Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $9,050,000.

Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $2,900,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $41,160,000, including 440 family housing units.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $1,230,000.
Kapaun Air Station, Germany, $900,000.
Leipheim Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Marienfelde Communications Station, Germany, $2,550,000.
Norvenich Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $47,470,000, including 400 family housing units.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $6,460,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $14,860,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $940,000.
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany, $1,700,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $5,700,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $5,070,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,280,000.
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy, $2,800,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $1,590,000.
Morocco, $3,100,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $13,710,000, including 140 family housing units.
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands, $270,000.
Vught, The Netherlands, $310,000.
Woensdrecht Air Base, The Netherlands, $22,700,000.
Torrejon Air Base, Spain, $12,187,000.
Zaragoza Air Base, Spain, $2,750,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $950,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $11,570,000.
Karatas, Turkey, $2,330,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $20,910,000.
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $12,050,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,630,000.
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $7,400,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,840,000.
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $10,320,000.
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $8,230,000.
RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $21,063,000.
RAF Sculthorpe, United Kingdom, $2,350,000.
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $4,640,000.
Various Locations, United Kingdom, $3,600,000.
Base 25, Classified Location, $4,500,000.
Base 29, Classified Location, $3,500,000.
Base 30, Classified Location, $4,830,000.
Base 33, Classified Location, $9,450,000.
Various Locations, Europe, $4,450,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 302. (a) Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $61,300,000, of which $19,939,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) The Secretary of the Air Force may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations, in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, twenty-four units, $1,200,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, eighty units, $406,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, thirty-two units, $3,009,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and ten units, $3,724,000.

Ramstein Air Base, Germany, two hundred and eighty units, $10,279,000.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, one hundred units, $6,605,000.

Kadena Air Base, Japan, two hundred and thirty-five units, $12,163,000.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, twenty-nine units, $1,042,000.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property, carry out military construction projects, and construct or acquire family housing units and facilities in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska, $1,390,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Alameda, California, $1,320,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Barstow, California, $825,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro, California, $700,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Groton, Connecticut, $625,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Port Tampa, Florida, $595,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fort Riley, Kansas, $965,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Newington, New Hampshire, $1,040,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Verona, New York, $1,395,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $470,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $8,085,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Texarkana, Texas, $2,635,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $3,825,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, $750,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, $5,355,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Richmond, Virginia, $650,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Manchester, Washington, $565,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $1,020,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Kaiserslautern, Germany, $360,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan, $8,160,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Tsurumi, Japan, $2,800,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pyongtaek, Korea, $5,820,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Uijongbu, Korea, $6,200,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Repromat Secure Storage Facility, Mineral Wells, Texas, $900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $82,142,000.

Classified Locations, $8,950,000, including 20 family housing units.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,000,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $29,200,000.

Classified Location, $3,142,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECTION 6 SCHOOLS

Fort Benning, Georgia, $1,693,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $5,660,000.

Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $8,400,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,400,000.

Quantico, Virginia, $3,500,000.

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, $9,753,000.

Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, Puerto Rico, $1,200,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $7,420,000.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, $2,290,000.

Babenhausen, Germany, $760,000.

Bamberg, Germany, $5,800,000.

Butzbach, Germany, $3,420,000.

Hanau, Germany, $7,480,000.

Heidelberg, Germany, $1,910,000.

Heilbronn, Germany, $2,520,000.

Pirmasens, Germany, $1,630,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, $3,930,000.

Sembach Air Base, Germany, $2,170,000.

Vilseck, Germany, $6,680,000.

Sigonella, Italy, $5,360,000.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, $4,780,000.

Okinawa, Japan, $745,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, $2,780,000.

Pusan, Korea, $1,540,000.

Taegu, Korea, $730,000.

Soesterberg Air Base, Netherlands, $4,460,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $7,190,000.
Rota, Spain, $2,870,000.
Bicester, United Kingdom, $4,570,000.
Upwood, United Kingdom, $3,240,000.
Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, $1,060,000.

IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

SEC. 402. Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $110,000.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY

SEC. 601. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,649,674,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects and for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities authorized by section 101, $2,026,760,000.

(2) For improvements to existing family housing units authorized by section 102 and section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, $166,000,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $31,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $155,120,000.

(5) For support of military family housing, $1,270,794,000.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY

SEC. 602. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,886,249,000 as follows: 02

(1) For military construction projects and for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities authorized by section 201, $2,096,780,000.

(2) For improvements to existing family housing units authorized by section 202 and section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, $34,020,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,560,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $146,096,000.

(5) For advance to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $2,960,000.

(6) For support of military family housing, $584,739,000.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE

SEC. 603. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,917,048,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects and for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities authorized by section 301, $1,925,114,000.

(2) For improvements to existing family housing units authorized by section 302 and section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, $61,300,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $149,960,000.

(5) For advance to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $30,240,000.

(6) For support of military family housing, $729,298,000.

(b) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 604. (a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $329,900,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects and for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities authorized by section 401, $272,400,000.

(2) For improvements to existing family housing units authorized by section 402 and section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, $110,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects under the contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(5) For architectual and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $30,000,000.

(6) For support of military family housing, $18,390,000.

(b) Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Defense Agencies that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, for military construction projects authorized in section 401 in the amount of $37,025,000.

(c) Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO

SEC. 605. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program, as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $98,000,000.

EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS: EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 606. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program, (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program, (and authorizations of appropriations therefore), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorizations Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure program.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607 (a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115, 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, and 301 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1986 or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,850,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(2) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,750,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(3) Range modernization in the amount of $2,450,000 at Wildflecken, Germany.

(4) Unaccompanied personnel housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(5) Operations building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(6) Multi-purpose recreation facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(7) Unaccompanied officer housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(8) Operations building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(9) Multi purpose recreation facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Operations control center in the amount of $7,800,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

(12) Engine test call modifications in the amount of $1,180,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida.

(13) Land acquisition in the amount of $830,000 at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California.

(14) Standby generator plant in the amount of $4,500,000 at the Naval Communications Area Master Station Eastern Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii.

(15) Air freight terminal in the amount of $10,200,000 at Elmendorf, Alaska.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW

SEC. 607. For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 or October 1, 1986, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000. 02

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States Code, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 32,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 608. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

AUTHORIZATION FOR FACILITIES

SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States $102,100,000 and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $70,700,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $51,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States $137,200,000 and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $66,800,000.

TITLE VIII

SEC. 801. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO TRANSMIT MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

SEC. 802. Section 2859 of title 10, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

LEASING OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 801. Subsections (g) (7), (8), and (9) of section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, are hereby repealed.

MILITARY HOUSING RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM

SEC. 802. Subsections (f), (g), and (h), of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984, Public Law 98-115, as amended, are hereby repealed.

PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOUSING POOLS

SEC. 803. (a) Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter II, the following new section:

"§ 2833. Department of State housing pools

"The Secretary concerned may enter into agreements with the Department of State to provide housing and related services for Department of Defense personnel overseas, on a reimbursable basis, when it is determined that there is a shortage of adequate housing in the area, and that participation in the Department of State housing pool is the most cost effective means of providing housing. Housing made available to the Department of Defense under the authority of this section shall not be included within the limitations of subsection 2828(e)(1) of this title. Agreements with the Department of State, made under the authority of this section, may not be executed until (1) the Secretary concerned provides to the appropriate committees of Congress written notification of the facts concerning the proposed agreement and (2) a period of 21 days has elapsed after the notification is received by those committees."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2833. Department of State housing pools."

OCCUPANT LIABILITY

SEC. 804. (a) Section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) strike the title of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following new title:

"§ 2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing",

(2) reletter subsections (b) through (e) as subsections (c) through (f), as appropriate, and insert after subsection (a) a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) A member of the armed forces shall be liable to the United States for failure to satisfactorily clean a family housing unit assigned to or provided that member upon termination of such assignment under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.",

(3) insert in relettered subsection (c), following the word "involved", the phrase "in determinations of liability under subsection (a)",

(4) insert in the first sentence of relettered subsection (d)(1), following the phrase "subsection (a)" the phrase "or the cost of any cleaning made necessary by any failure to clean a family housing unit referred to in subsection (b)",

(5) insert in relettered subsection (e), following the phrase "(or the equipment or furnishings of a family housing unit)", the phrase "or failure to satisfactorily clean a family housing unit", and

(6) strike relettered subsection (f) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this section, including (1) regulations for determining the cost of repairs and replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence referred to in subsection (a), (2) regulations for determining the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of the failure to clean a family housing unit referred to in subsection (b), and (3) regulations providing for limitations of liability, the compromise or waiver of claims, and the collection of amounts owed under this section.".

(b) Strike the item relating to section 2775 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 of such title and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing.".

PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS

SEC. 805. Section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "any period" and inserting in lieu thereof "a construction period of up to 36 months and a term".

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 806. (a) Section 2821 of the title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) at the end thereof as follows:

> "(d) Amounts authorized by law for the construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for (1) minor construction, and (2) relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of this title.".

(b)(1) Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter II, the following new section:

"§ 2834. Family Housing Support

"Amounts authorized by law for support of military family housing include amounts for operating expenses, leasing expenses, maintenance of real property expenses, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, and payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m)."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to § 2833, as added by section 804 of this Act, the following;

"2834. Family housing support."

DOMESTIC LEASED HOUSING

SEC. 807. Subsection 2828(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "500 housing units" and inserting in lieu thereof "1,000 housing units".

SALE AND REPLACEMENT

SEC. 808. (a). Subsection 807(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Pub. L. No. 98-115), is amended by striking "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to carry out Sale and Replacement transactions under the authority of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code, consisting of (1) warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii and (2) a NCO professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

ACQUISITION: INTERESTS IN LAND

SEC. 809. (a) Section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the number $100,000 each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the number $400,000.

(b) The title of section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, and the item relating to section 2672 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title, are amended by striking the number "$100,000" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the number "$400,000".

TURN-KEY CONTRACTS

SEC. 810. (a) Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter III, the following new section:

"§ 2862. Turn-key contracts

"The Secretaries of the Military Departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may enter into contracts for the construction of authorized military construction projects and contracts for the construction of authorized family housing units and facilities using turn-key competitive negotiation procedures."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to § 2861 the following:

"2862. Turn-key contracts."

FACILITIES AND SERVICE CONTRACTS

SEC. 811. (a) Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter I the following new section:

"§ 2809. Facilities and service contracts

"The Secretary concerned may enter into contracts, for periods not to exceed 20 years, for the lease of facilities on or near a military installation (including utilities, supplies, and services), and for the management, maintenance and operation of such facilities. The costs of such contracts may be paid out of annual appropriations available for that year."

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2808 the following:

"2809. Facilities and service contracts."

UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 812. Section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (a) strike "Within the amount authorized by law for such purpose, the", and insert in lieu thereof "The", and

(b) In subsection (c) strike "Only funds authorized for minor construction projects may be used to accomplish unspecified minor construction projects, except that the", and insert in lieu thereof "The".

TITLE IX

SEC. 901. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1987 such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO TRANSMIT MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REAUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Sec. 902. Section 2859 of title 10, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

General Counsel of the Department of Defense,
Washington, DC, March 12, 1985.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: On February 14, 1985, the Acting General Counsel forwarded a draft Military Construction Authorization Bill for FY 1986 as required by section 2859 of title 10, United States Code. This draft bill did not include the Department of Defenses' proposed general provisions because they were not approved by the Office of Management and Budget at that time.

The Department's proposed general provisions have now been approved and are enclosed for your consideration. Please substitute the enclosed titles VII and IX for the title VIII that was initially forwarded to you. I have also enclosed a brief description of each provision.

These provisions will encourage innovation and competition, and provide alternatives to the use of tax dollars to provide defense facilities. Your support of these proposals will allow us to manage our resources more efficiently and will enhance military preparedness.

Sincerely,

Chapman B. Cox.

Enclosures.

Fiscal Year 1986 Legislative Provisions

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

The general provisions in this year's bill have been drafted to provide the Department of Defense with the necessary authority to better manage its programs and resources by eliminating legislative impediments. All are proposed to provide better ways to manage, lead to better working and living conditions for our people, and to increase morale and readiness. The draft legislation includes the following provisions:

Sec. 801. Leasing of Military Family Housing

Modify subsection 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code concerning the leasing of family housing units. The modification makes this a permanent authority and eliminates the limitations on the number of agreements and units.

Sec. 802. Military Housing Rental Guarantee Program

Modify section 802 of the FY 1984 Military Construction Authorization Act, concerning the family housing rental guarantee program. The modification eliminates the limitations on the number of agreements and units and makes this a permanent authority.

Sec. 803. Participation in Department Of State Housing Pools

Allow the Department of Defense to participate in Department of State (DOS) housing pools at DOS specified locations. Participation is an alternative to existing family housing leasing programs. While savings of DOD costs are not expected, we will rely on the DOS for family housing and use available leasing authority at other foreign locations.

Sec. 804. Occupant Liability

Modify section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, concerning an occupant's liability for damage to family housing units to encourage the cleaning of housing by occupants when vacating the unit.

Sec. 805. Preoccupancy Termination Costs

Modify section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, to provide the authority to pay preoccupancy termination costs under family housing build/lease agreements.

Sec. 806. Activities Included Within Authorizations For Military Family Housing

This provision will codify provisions of the annual military construction authorization bill concerning family housing construction support. This is a technical change.

Sec. 807. Domestic Leased Housing

Increase the number of domestic leases that can exceed the maximum annual rental limitation from 500 to 1,000 housing units.

Sec. 808. Sale And Replacement of Non-Excess Real Property

Modify section 2667a of title 10, United States Code, concerning the Sale and Replacement of Non-Excess Real Property by extending the sunset date to October 1, 1986.

The Secretary of Defense must be authorized to carry out Sale and Replacement transactions under the authority of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code. The FY 1986 program includes two transactions. The first is for warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii and the second is for a NCO professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

Sec. 809. Land Acquisition

Modify section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, to increase our authority to acquire lands without specific statutory authority from $100,000 to $400,000.

Sec. 810. Turn-Key Contracts

Allow the military departments to enter into contracts for authorized military construction projects and authorized family housing projects using turn-key competitive negotiation procedures.

Sec. 811. Facilities and Service Contracts

Add a new section to title 10, United States Code to permit long-term leases for military facilities.

Sec. 812. Unspecified Minor Construction

Modify Section 2805(c) of title 10, United States Code, concerning unspecified minor construction projects. The modification would permit reprogramming into the minor construction account.

Department of Energy,
Washington, DC, March 21, 1985.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is proposed legislation "[t]o authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes." This bill would authorize specific appropriations for FY 86 and those appropriations which might be necessary for FY 87. The total amount proposed in title I for FY 86 is $7,958,710,000 of which $6,187,022,000 is for operation expenses, $480,387,000 is for capital equipment, and $1,291,301,000 is for construction projects.

Title II sets forth general provisions that would govern reprogramming of funds, general plant projects, construction projects, fund transfers, construction designs, and availability of funds.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of this legislative proposal would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Eric J. Fygi, *Acting General Counsel.*

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Security Programs Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1986 and 1987."

TITLE I—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OPERATING EXPENSES

Sec. 101. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1986 for operating expenses incurred in carrying out national security programs (including scientific research and development in support of the Armed Forces, strategic and critcal materials necessary for the common defense, and military applications of nuclear energy and related management and support activities) as follows:

(1) For weapons activities, $3,505,400,000.

(2) For materials production, $1,616,300,000.

(3) For defense waste and byproducts management, $405,122,000.

(4) For verification and control technology, $83,475,000.

(5) For nuclear safeguards and security, $45,325,000.

(6) For security investigations, $33,400,000.

(7) For naval reactors development, $489,000,000.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

SEC. 102. Funds are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy fiscal year 1986 for plant and capital equipment (including planning, construction, acquisition, and modification of facilities, land acquisition related thereto, and acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction) necessary for national security programs as follows:

(1) For weapons activities:

Project 86-D-101, general plant projects, various locations, $29,900,000.

Project 86-D-121, general plant projects, various locaitons, $33,700,000.

Project 86-D-103, decontamination and waste treatment facility, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $100,000,000.

Project 86-D-104, strategic defenses facility, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $8,000,000.

Project 86-D-122, structural upgrade of existing plutonium facilities, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $3,000,000.

Project 86-D-123, environmental hazards elimination, various locations, $8,700,000.

Project 86-D-124, safeguards and site security upgrading, Phase II, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, Ohio, $3,000,000.

Project 86-D-125, safeguards and site security upgrade, Phase II, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $1,500,000.

Project 86-D-130, Tritium loading facility replacement, Savannah River Plant, Aiken, South Carolina, $5,000,000.

Project 85-D-102, nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, Phase I, various locations, $81,600,000, for a total project authorization of $117,000,000.

Project 85-D-103, safeguards and security enhancements, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $27,900,000, for a total project authorization of $32,600,000.

Project 85-D-105, combined device assembly facility, Nevada Test Site, Nevada, $45,400,000, for a total project authorization of $53,000,000.

Project 85-D-106, hardened engineering test building, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California, $1,900,000, for a total project authorization of $2,700,000.

Project 85-D-112, enriched uranium recovery improvements, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $15,300,000, for a total project authorization of $19,800,000.

Project 85-D-113, power plant and steam distribution system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $18,500,000, for a total project authorization of $23,000,000.

Project 85-D-115, renovate plutonium builiding utility systems, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $17,700,000, for a total project authorization of $20,600,000.

Project 85-D-121, air and water pollution control facilities, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $14,000,000, for a total project authorization of $19,000,000.

Project 85-D-123, safeguards and site security upgrade, Phase I, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $4,000,000, for a total project authorization of $5,000,000.

Project 85-D-124, safeguards and site security upgrade, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado, $2,400,000, for a total project authorization of $3,400,000.

Project 85-D-125, tactical bomb production facilities, various locations, $11,000,000, for a total project authorization of $21,000,000.

Project 84-D-102, radiation-hardened integrated circuit laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $15,500,000, for a total project authorization of $37,500,000.

Project 84-D-104, nuclear materials storage facility, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $12,100,000, for a total project authorization of $19,300,000.

Project 84-D-107, nuclear testing facilities revitalization, various locations, $30,540,000, for a total project authorization of $65,940,000.

Project 84-D-112, TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations, $60,700,000, for a total project authorization of $140,700,000.

Project 84-D-113, antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead production facilities, various locations, $16,000,000.

Project 84-D-115, electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $3,300,000, for a total project authorization of $14,800,000.

Project 84-D-117, inert assembly and test facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $400,000, for a total project authorization of $13,600,000.

Project 84-D-118, high-explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $40,000,000, for a total project authorization of $47,000,000.

Project 84-D-120, explosive component test facility, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, Ohio, $2,300,000, for a total project authorization of $22,300,000.

Project 84-D-211, safeguards and site security upgrading, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $7,500,000, for a total project authorization of $23,000,000.

Project 84-D-212, safeguards and site security upgrade, Pinellas Plant, Florida, $3,800,000, for a total project authorization of $7,500,000.

Project 83-D-199, buffer land acquisition, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, Livermore, California, $17,000,000, for a total project authorization of $34,000,000.

Project 82-D-107, utilities and equipment restoration, replacement, and upgrade, Phase III, various locations, $195,500,000, for a total project authorization of $765,900,000.

Project 82-D-111, interactive graphics systems, various locations, $6,000,000, for a total project authorization of $26,000,000.

Project 82-D-144, simulation technology laboratory, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $10,300,000, for a total project authorization of $34,000,000.

Project 79-7-0, universal pilot plant, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $4,500,000, for a total project authorization of $20,400,000.

(2) For materials production:

Project 86-D-146, general plant projects, various locations, $34,800,000.

Project 86-D-149, productivity retention program, Phase I, various locations, $27,200,000.

Project 86-D-150, in-core neutron monitoring system, N reactor, Richland, Washington, $5,460,000.

Project 86-D-151, PUREX electrical system upgrade, Richland, Washington, $3,500,000.

Project 86-D-152, reactor electrical distribution system, Savannah River, South Carolina, $4,000,000.

Project 86-D-153, additional line III furnace, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,000,000.

Project 86-D-154, effluent treatment facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,500,000.

Project 86-D-156, plantwide safeguards systems, Savannah River, South Carolina, $3,000,000.

Project 86-D-157, hydrofluorination system—FB-line, Savannah River, South Carolina, $2,200,000.

Project 86-D-137, vault safety special nuclear material inventory system, Richland, Washington, $1,900,000, for a total project authorization of $4,400,000.

Project 86-D-139, fuel processing restoration, Idaho Fuels Processing Facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $15,000,000, for a total project authorization of $25,000,000.

Project 86-D-140, productivity and radiological improvements, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $12,000,000, for a total project authorization of $18,000,000.

Project 85-D-145, fuel production facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $16,000,000, for a total project authorization of $25,800,000.

Project 84-D-135, process facility modifications, Richland, Washington, $15,000,000, for a total project authorization of $32,500,000.

Project 84-D-136, enriched uranium conversion facility modifications, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $7,200,000, for a total project authorization of $19,600,000.

Project 83-D-148, non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, South Carolina, $3,100,000, for a total project authorization of $22,100,000.

Project 82-D-124, restoration of production capabilities, Phases II, III, IV, and V, various locations, $48,900,000, for a total project authorization of $349,534,000.

Project 82-D-210, special plutonium recovery facilities, JB-Line, Savannah River, South Carolina, $4,400,000, for a total project authorization of $83,800,000.

(3) For defense waste and byproducts management:

Project 86-D-171, general plant projects, interim waste operations and long-term waste management technology, various locations, $26,451,000.

Project 86-D-172, B plant F filter, Richland, Washington, $1,000,000.

Project 86-D-173, central waste disposal facility, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $1,000,000.

Project 86-D-174, low-level waste processing and shipping system, Feed Materials Production Center, Fernald, Ohio, $2,500,000.

Project 86-D-175, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory security upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $2,000,000.

Project 85-D-157, seventh calcined solids storage facility, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho, $14,500,000, for a total project authorization of $21,500,000.

Project 85-D-158, central warehouse upgrade, Richland, Washington, $5,000,000, for a total project authorization of $5,700,000.

Project 85-D-159, new waste transfer facilities, H-Area, Savannah River, South Carolina, $9,000,000, for a total project authorization of $20,000,000.

Project 85-D-160, test reactor area security system upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Idaho, $2,2500,000, for a total project authorization of $4,250,000.

Project 81-D-105, defense waste processing facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $205,000,000, for a total project authorization of $637,500,000.

(4) For verification and control technology:

Project 85-D-171, space science laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $4,500,000, for a total project authorization of $5,000,000

(5) Nuclear safeguards and security:

Project 86-D-186, nuclear safeguards technology laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $1,000,000.

(6) For naval reactors development:

Project 86-N-101, general plant projects, various locations, $7,500,000.

Project 86-N-104, reactor modifications, advance test reactor, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, $4,500,000.

Project 82-N-111, materials facility, Savannah River, South Carolina, $11,000,000, for a total project authorization of $176,000,000.

Project 81-T-112, modification and additions to prototype facilities, various locations, $27,000,000, for a total project authorization of $137,000,000.

(7) For capital equipment not related to construction—

(A) for weapons activities, $277,750,000;

(B) for materials production, $123,440,000;

(C) for defense waste and byproducts management, $38,997,000;

(D) for verification and control technology, $5,600,000;

(E) for nuclear safeguards and security, $4,600,000; and,

(F) for naval reactors development, $30,000,000.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPROGRAMMING

SEC. 201. Except as otherwise provided in this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of 105 percent of the amount authorized for that program by this Act or $10,000,000 more than the amount authorized for that program by this Act, whichever is the lesser, and

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to, or requested of, the Congress,

unless the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") transmits to the appropriate committees of Congress a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken with respect to the program and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the proposed action.

LIMITS ON GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

SEC. 202. (a) The Secretary may carry out any construction project under the general plant projects provisions authorized by this Act if the total estimated cost of the construction project does not exceed $1,200,000.

(b) If at any time during the construction of any general plant project authorized by this Act, the estimated cost of the project is revised because of unforeseen cost variations and the revised cost of the project exceeds $1,200,000, the Secretary shall immediately furnish a complete report to the appropriate committees of Congress explaining the reasons for the cost variation.

LIMITS ON CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

SEC. 203. (a) Whenever the current estimated cost of a construction project which is authorized by section 102 of this Act, or which is in support of national security programs of the Department of Energy and was authorized by any previous Act, exceeds by more than 25 percent the higher or (1) the amount authorized for the project, or (2) the amount of the total estimated cost for the project as shown in the most recent budget justification data submitted to Congress, construction may not be started or additional obligations incurred in connection with the project above the total estimated cost, as the case may be, unless a period of thirty calendar days (not including any day in which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three days to a day certain) has passed after receipt by the appropriate committees of the Congress of written notice from the Secretary containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of the action.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to any construction project which has a current estimated cost of less than $5,000,000.

FUND TRANSFER AUTHORITY

SEC. 204. To extent specified in appropriation Acts, funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be transferred to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which the funds were appropriated, and funds so transferred may be merged with the appropriations of the agency to which the funds are transferred.

AUTHORITY FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION DESIGN

SEC. 205. The Secretary may perform planning and design utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously in order to meet the needs of national defense or to protect property or human life.

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALL NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 206. Subject to the provisions of appropriation Acts, amounts appropriated pursuant to this act for management and support activities and for general plant projects are available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 207. When so specified in an appropriation Act, amounts appropriated for "Operating Expenses" or for "Plant and Capital Equipment" may remain available until expended.

TITLE III—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy to be available not earlier than October 1, 1986, such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1987 for programs set forth in this Act.

Federal Emergency Management Agency,
Washington, DC, February 11, 1985.

Hon. George Bush,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. President: Inclused is draft legislation "To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes."

In accordance with section 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2260), the bill authorizes appropriations of $119,125,000 for civil defense programs for fiscal year 1986, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1987.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for consideration of the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

George Jett,
General Counsel.

Enclosure.

A BILL To authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, to carry out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, the sum of $119,125,000, and for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, such sums as may be necessary.

COMMITTEE ACTION

In accordance with the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986.

In favor: Senators Goldwater, Thurmond, Warner, Humphrey, Cohen, Quayle, East, Wilson, Denton, Gramm, Nunn, Stennis, Hart, Kennedy, Bingaman, Dixon and Glenn.

Opposed: Senators Exon and Levin.

Vote: 17–2.

The other roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of markup have been made public and are available at the committee.

FISCAL DATA

With respect to 5-year cost projections, under Public Law 91-510, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, certain Senate rules and procedures were revised. Shown below is the legislative language:

> SEC. 252(a)(1) The report accompanying each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall contain—
>
> (A) an estimate, made by such committee, of the costs which would be insured in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by such bill or joint resolution if less than five years), except that, in the case of measures affecting the revenues, such report shall require only an estimate of the gain or loss in revenues for a one-year period; and
>
> (B) a comparison of the estimate of costs described in subparagraph (A) made by such committee with any estimate of costs made by any Federal agency;
>
> (C) in lieu of such estimate or comparison, or both, a statement of the reason why compliance by the committee with requirements of subparagraph (A) or (B), or both, is impracticable.
>
> (2) It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any such bill or joint resolution if such bill or joint resolution was reported in the Senate after the effective date of this subsection and the report of that committee of the Senate which reported such bill or joint resolution does not comply with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

Below is the letter received in compliance with the legislation. The bill is an annual authorization and does not, within its own terms, generate costs beyond fiscal year 1985 even though the funds authorized to be obligated by this act may not be expended for several years in the future. The fiscal year authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, April 4, 1985.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P. L. 91-510), the enclosed schedule provides an estimate of how the authorization now requested in fiscal year 1986 will be expended over the fiscal year 1986–1990 period.

The uncertainty of future year Defense programs precludes precise projections, but the enclosed schedule provides my estimate of the range of authorizations required during each of the next four years to support the forces contained in the annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1986 budget.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. HELM,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

Enclosure.

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES

Fiscal year 1986 authorization request: $240,955 million—

1986	$100,496
1987	68,820
1988	35,643
1989	17,470
1990	9,760
1991	6,502
Beyond	2,264

I estimate that to support the forces in the Annual Defense Report on the fiscal year 1986 budget, authorizations in the range of $275–$383 billion for fiscal years 1987–1990 would be required.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 26, 1985.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate on The Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1986, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on April 4, 1985.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on the attached cost estimate.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER, *Director.*

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: Unassigned.

2. Bill title: Omnibus Defense Authorization Act, 1986.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, on April 4, 1985.

4. Bill purpose: This bill authorizes appropriaions for the Armed Forces during fiscal year 1986 for:

The procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons;
Research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E);
Operation and maintenance (O&M);
Military Construction;
Atomic Energy Defense Activities;
Civil defense; and
Military personnel and compensation matters.

This bill prescribes authorized personnel strengths for each active duty component, for the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component, and for military training student loads.

The bill includes additional provisions which do not have a significant cost impact.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: This bill would entail costs to the federal government in fiscal years 1986–1990, as shown in the following table.

45-603 O—85——14

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED COSTS OF THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Function 050:					
Direct authorizations:					
Authorized level	239,984				
Estimated outlays	105,907	65,674	33,421	13,108	7,003
Estimated authorizations:					
Estimated BA/authority level	71,766	−251	−324	−347	−384
Estimated outlays	70,111	2,437	−67	−243	−304
Subtotal—Function 050:					
Estimated authority level	311,749	−251	−324	−347	−384
Estimated outlays	176,018	68,111	33,353	12,865	6,699
Other functions:					
Estimated BA/authority level	−3,394	−21	−13	−11	20
Estimated outlays	−21,462	−20	−13	−11	20
Bill total:					
Estimated authorizations/BA	308,355	−272	−337	−358	−364
Estimated outlays	154,556	68,091	33,340	12,854	6,718
Potential civilian pay raise:					
Estimated authorization level	919				
Estimated oulays	904	15			
Revised Total:					
Estimated Authorizations/BA	309,274	−272	−337	−358	−364
Estimated outlays	155,460	68,106	33,340	12,854	6,719

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Basis for Estimates: All estimates assume that funds will be appropriated for the full amount of the authorization and will be available for obligation by October 1, 1985, unless otherwise specified. Outlays are estimated based on historical outlay rates for the relevant accounts.

The bill states authorizations for appropriations for several accounts totalling $240.0 billion for 1986. (Such authorizations occur annually.) Table 2 shows the costs for each directly authorized account.

TABLE 2.—DIRECT AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTORIZATION ACT, 1986 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Procurement:					
Authorization level	102,244				
Estimated outlays	13,770	33,909	26,536	11,090	6,714
RDT&E:					
Authorization level	37,518				
Estimated outlays	19,066	13,367	2,568	1,018	
O&M:					
Authorization level	83,190				
Estimated outlays	66,535	12,841	1,503		
Military construction:					
Authorization level	9,155				
Estimated outlays	2,343	3,211	1,720	797	288

TABLE 2.—DIRECT AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTORIZATION ACT, 1986 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Atomic energy defense:					
Authorization level	7,756				
Estimated outlays	4,138	2,287	1,089	202	
Civil defense:					
Authorization level	119				
Estimated outlays	55	59	5		
Special foreign currency:					
Authorization level	2				
Estimated outlays	(1)	(1)	1	1	
Total:					
Authorization level	239,984				
Estimated outlays	105,907	65,674	33,421	13,108	7,003

[1] Less than 500 millions.

In addition, the bill contains several provisions that affect seven budget functions and that require CBO to estimate cost impacts for 1986 and the outyears. Table 3 shows the costs of such provisions affecting function 050.

TABLE 3.—AUTHORIZATIONS IN FUNCTION 050 IN THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
End-strengths:					
Estimated authorization level	71,949				
Estimated outlays	69,787	2,162			
Housing allowances:					
Estimated authorization level	−14	8	23	31	37
Estimated outlays	117	7	22	31	37
Travel allowances:					
Estimated authorization level	412	420	426	432	436
Estimated outlays	398	420	426	431	436
Reserve bonuses:					
Estimated authorization level	80	94	35	28	17
Estimated outlays	77	93	36	28	17
Stockpile acquisitions: Estimated outlays	−230	140	90		
Davis-Bacon repeal:					
Estimated authorization level	−200	−205	−215	−220	−230
Estimated outlays	−65	−125	−170	−190	−205
Ovetime pay restrictions:					
Estimated authorization level	−555	−575	−600	−625	−650
Estimated outlays	−65	−270	−480	−550	−595
Special defense acquisition fund:					
Estimated budget authority	100				
Estimated outlays	100				
Other 050:					
Estimated authorization level	−6	7	7	7	6
Estimated outlays	−9	10	7	7	6
Function 050 total:					
Estimated authorizations/BA	71,766	−251	−324	−347	−384
Estimated outlays	70,111	2,437	−67	−243	−304

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

The estimated cost of authorized active and reserve military personnel levels are based on average pay and allowances under current law, including an amount for retired pay accrual.

In addition to specifying personnel levels, the bill also authorizes certain changes in military compensation. Under current law, federal employees receive pay raises each October, as determined by the President and the Congress under the provisions of the Pay Comparability Act of 1970. This bill changes current law to provide pay raises for military personnel in January 1986 instead of October 1985. The pay raise authorized in this bill saves $1,039 million in estimated authorization and $1,021 million in estimated outlays from the 4.0 percent pay raise contained in the baseline used by the Senate Budget Committee for mark-up of the first budget resolution.

Section 502 expands the Variable Housing Allowance (VHA) program to cover military personnel living off base in Alaska and Hawaii. Personnel currently under the rent plus system would not be affected by this new provision. The cost of this and other housing allowances in this bill are shown in the table below.

Section 504 provides for the advance payment of Basic Allowances for Quarters (BAQ) as well as the advance payment of VHA. Department of Defense (DoD) and CBO have no precise estimate of the number of personnel who could take advantage of this provision and the average number of months for which an advance would be requested. For purposes of this estimate, it was assumed that, in 1986, this provision would be used only by personnel making Permanent Change of Station (PCS) moves and also renting quarters instead of owning a house and that only 50 percent of these people would ask for one month's advance resulting in an increase of $130 million in outlays for 1986. Costs could be as high as $260 million if all members renting and making a PCS move asked for a one month's advance or as low as $26 million if only 10 percent applied.

Section 505 increases the Family Separation allowance from $30 per month to $60 per month. Military members on permanent duty outside the United States, or in Alaska, could receive this monthly allowance if the movement of their dependents to their permanent duty station is not authorized at the expense of the United States and the dependents do not reside at or near that station. Members are also eligible for this allowance if they serve on board a ship away from its home port for a continuous period of more than 30 days. They are also eligible if on temporary duty for a continuous period of more than 30 days away from the permanent duty station, and dependents do not live near the temporary duty location.

[BY fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
VHA in Alaska and Hawaii:					
Estimated authority level	−2	−4	−4	−4	−4
Estimated outlays	−2	−4	−4	−4	−4
Advance payments:					
Estimated authority level					
Estimated outlays	130				

[BY fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Family separation allowance:					
Estimated authority level	42	42	42	42	42
Estimated outlays	41	42	42	42	42
VHA limitations:					
Estimated authority level	−54	−30	−15	−8	−1
Estimated outlays	−52	−31	−16	−8	−1
Total housing provisions:					
Estimated authority level	−14	8	23	31	37
Estimated outlays	117	7	22	31	37

The bill contains a provision that saves $54 million in 1986 by eliminating VHA windfall payments. Some people receive more in VHA and BAQ than their actual costs; this windfall would be eliminated because BAQ and VHA payments would be limited to the actual costs.

Three sections of the bill change language on previous authorizations. Section 506 directs that a temporary lodging expense of $110 per day for a maximum of 4 days be paid to eligible service members. Current law says that service secretaries "may" pay such an amount; this bill would say that service secretaries "shall" pay the amount. Similarly, section 507 provides for a mileage allowance for minors under 2 years of age when the military member makes a PCS move and would cost $10.1 million in 1986. Section 508 provides military members a new household goods weight allowance when making a PCS move. The new allowance will vary by grade for a total cost of $269.2 million in 1986.

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Temporary lodging expenses:					
Estimated authority level	133	134	135	135	136
Estimated outlays	129	134	135	135	136
Minors' mileage:					
Estimated authority level	10	10	10	10	10
Estimated outlays	8	10	10	10	10
Household goods allowance:					
Estimated authority level	269	276	281	286	290
Estimated outlays	261	276	281	286	290
Total—Travel allowances:					
Estimated authority level	412	420	426	432	436
Estimated outlays	398	420	426	431	436

Section 513 authorizes the extension of certain reserve forces bonus authorities for a two-year period, ending September 30, 1987. The estimated authorization is $80 million in 1986 and $94 million in 1987. The costs in 1988–1990 are associated with anniversary payments for those obligations incurred in 1986–1987.

Provisions under section 802 would divert 30 percent of the net income of the Naval Petroleum Reserve in fiscal year 1986, about

$280 million, to the National Defense Stockpile transaction fund, a revolving fund. Without this legislation, these funds would have been a receipt under function 270. The $280 million would be a function 050 collection in fiscal year 1986 and would be spent over three years to acquire materials for the strategic stockpile. About $50 million would be spent in 1986, $140 million in 1987 and $90 million in 1988 for these acquisitions.

Section 711 would repeal the Davis Bacon Act for military construction projects if the fiscal year 1986 First Concurrent Budget Resolution provides less than $312.3 billion in budget authority for function 050. The Davis Bacon Act, which requires the payment of "prevailing wages" on federal construction projects of $2,000 or more, has the purpose of maintaining federal construction wage levels, attracting skilled labor, and assuring that the federal government does business with reputable contractors. However, most economists agree that the method by which wage determinations are made, the absence of separate wage determinations for the less costly helper class of construction worker, and the compliance burden itself—the obligation of federal contractors to submit weekly payroll information—all act to inflate federal construction costs and thereby increase budgetary outlays.

The fiscal impact of this section is estimated by taking the amount authorized for military construction in fiscal year 1986 in this bill, adjusting for inflation for fiscal years 1987 through 1990, and multiplying by the percentage of federal construction cost increases attributable to Davis Bacon requirements, modified to reflect the recently changed regulations—3.3 percent—to arrive at a final measure of the savings of repeal. Because construction projects typically take several years to complete, the budget authority for a given year's contrast spend out over several years, making the outlay savings relatively small in the initial years.

Section 712 would prohibit DoD from paying civilian salaries based on prevailing wages outside of the revelant area. CBO has no information on which to base a cost estimate for this provision though it would probably produce some savings.

Section 713 would shield Department of Defense contracts from those provisions of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act mandating an overtime wage premium for work over eight hours in a day. It would require overtime pay for work in excess of ten hours per day. The fiscal impact of this section is estimated by inflating the value of contracts subject to Walsh-Healey in fiscal year 1984 by CBO's deflator for federal purchases and by assuming that .5 percent of this value is saved each year.

Section 901 increases the capitalization of the Sepcial Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF) by $100 million. Funds that now appear in the Defense budget as offsetting receipts would appear in SDAF (function 150) as offsetting collections (see Table 4).

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF THE OMNIBUS DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986 AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IN FUNCTIONS OTHER THAN 050

[By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

Category	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Function 150: Estimated Outlays	−100				
Function 270:					
Estimated budget Authority	280				
Estimated outlays	280				
Function 400:					
Estimated authorization level	40				
Estimated outlays	39	1			
Function 600:					
Estimated authorization level	17,967				
Estimated outlays					
Function 700:					
Estimated budget authority	6	−21	−13	−11	20
Estimated outlays	6	−21	−13	−11	20
Function 950:					
Estimated authorization level	−21,687				
Estimated outlays	−21,687				
Total—Functions other than 050:					
Estimated authority/BA	−3,394	−21	−13	−11	20
Estimated outlays	21,462	−20	−13	−11	20

Function 270 would increase by $280 million because offsetting receipts would be transferred to function 050 as described above.

The bill authorizes an average of 12,500 for the Coast Guard Reserve; the associated costs fall under budget function 400.

Function 600 records the accrual amounts for the military retirement trust fund. The military endstrengths authorized in this bill have a retirement accrual cost of $17,967 million. Similarly, receipts in function 950 are affected because this function receives the accrual payments from function 050 associated with military retirement accrual and employer contributions to social security. Function 950 also receives civil service retirement contributions associated with DoD's civilian employees which are also authorized in this bill.

Section 522 would change the Veterans Education Assistance Act of 1984 so that members could choose to join the program during the first four months of their service in the Armed Forces. This would delay contributions, which are shown in function 700 as offsetting receipts, and consequently would raise outlays in the early years and lower outlays in the later years. The budget impact over the period from 1985–1989 would be zero.

A second change would allow service members to joing the educational benefits program and then withdraw at any time in the first two years. They could receive a refund after their initial obligated period of duty. Under current law, approximately 45 percent of those eligible to receive supplemental benefits and 14 percent of those eligible to receive basic benefits are estimated to contribute and train under the program. This estimate assumes that an additional 10 percent of eligibles would choose to contribute because they would have the option of withdrawing. It is assumed these additional service members would contribute, on average, for six months and would withdraw their contribution three to four years after they started active duty. Since it is assumed that no additional service members would choose to train because of this change, the budget impact over time would be zero. However, increased contributions would increase budget authority and outlays in function 700 from 1986-1988 and increase budget authority and outlays from 1989-1992.

The only change in section 522 which would be estimated to increase the cost of the program over time is the provision which allows eligible members who quality under the old GI bill and who have a break in service since December 31, 1976 to participate in the new program. Of the 6,500 individuals estimated to leave the Armed Forces in 1989 and 1990, about 1,600 would choose to train in 1990. This change would cost $4 million in 1990, the first year that anyone could receive funds under this program.

Section 302 provides that the authorization for operation and maintenance be rasied to be consistent with unanticipated pay raises for federal civilians. Based on the baseline used by the Senate Budget Committee civilians would receive a 4 percent pay raise on October 1, 1985 and consequently the authorizations for appropriations in this bill would rise by $919 million.

6. Estimated cost to State and local Governments: None.

7. Estimate comparison: None.

8. Previous cost estimate: None.

9. Estimate prepared by: Eugene Bryton, Julia Doherty, Peter Fontaine, Richard J. Hendrix, Kelly Lukins, Michael J. McCord, Edward J. Shephard, Jonathan Tyson, and Joseph C. Whitehill.

10. Estimate approved by: James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON PROCUREMENT, R.D.T.&E., OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY, AND CIVIL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Fiscal year	Authorization request	Senate authorization	House authorization	Conference	Appropriated
1964	$15,358,691	$14,951,491	$15,856,391	$15,314,291	$14,364,690
1965	17,185,300	17,040,140	16,914,800	16,967,620	16,722,391
1966	19,363,050	15,283,800	15,303,400	[1] 19,468,250	[1] 19,320,550
1967	20,769,659	17,170,059	17,858,059	[1] 21,404,459	[1] 21,057,559
1968	21,066,432	20,765,332	21,481,032	21,168,032	30,149,432
1969	22,385,052	21,341,738	[1] 21,636,964	21,625,750	18,491,041
1970	21,963,660	19,988,886	21,347,860	20,710,502	[2] 19,311,520
1971	20,317,430	[3] 19,242,889	20,237,439	[3] 19,929,089	[3] 18,997,376
1972	[4 5 7] 22,359,129	[6] 21,016,417	[5] 21,252,682	[6] 21,316,870	20,461,802
1973	[8] 23,272,971	20,521,671	21,318,788	[9] 21,588,747	19,567,838
1974 [10 12]	21,959,100	20,947,563	20,445,255	21,299,520	20,163,250
1975 [11]	23,130,139	21,819,371	22,642,963	22,195,037	[13] 20,892,540
1976	28,562,388	[15] 25,233,535	26,539,023	25,513,383	24,850,879
197T	5,863,737	5,271,798	5,474,017	5,354,[illegible]23	5,193,638
1977	[14] 34,218,765	31,831,348	33,256,443	32,522,202	31,626,183
1978	[16] 36,258,150	36,329,077	36,484,962	36,573,681	33,771,625
1979	[17] 37,486,012	37,339,869	36,557,869	37,255,969	35,461,500
1980	40,123,241	40,108,896	41,393,243	41,390,457	40,644,202
1981 [18]	49,867,194	54,697,886	55,718,266	55,523,246	53,487,013
1982 [19]	136,491,251	136,536,111	136,111,036	130,969,451	129,403,191
1983	183,451,654	177,397,810	177,066,115	177,867,548	169,513,224
1984	197,968,162	186,052,235	187,771,900	187,490,599	182,544,079
1985	224,496,604	213,542,429	208,053,804	212,982,460	207,553,861
1986	230,465,375	223,067,798			

---

[1] Includes supplemental which is not included in House/Senate authorizations since supplemental request was received subsequent to House/Senate action on initial authorization request.

[2] Of this amount $350,000,000 to be derived by transfer from stock funds.

[3] Includes $334,000,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[4] Reflects budget amendment submitted subsequent to House action (+$111,000,000).

[5] Includes $183,600,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[6] Includes $109,570,000 for Safeguard construction and family housing.

[7] Includes $59,762,000 additional requested for civilian pay increases pursuant to Public Law 91-656.

[8] Includes $3,000,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E., appropriation: includes fiscal year 1973 budget amendments of $54,000,000 for civilian personnel pay raise. $254,800,000 for various programs, and June 27, 1972, amendments of $170,000,000 for Southeast Asia and SALT related items.

[9] Includes $644,900,000 additional authorization in sec. 801 of Public Law 92-570.

[10] Includes $2,600,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E. appropriation.

[11] Includes $2,570,000 for special foreign currency program for Navy under R.D.T.&E. appropriation.

[12] Does not include the Feb. 4, 1974 supplemental authorization request for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $1,244,589,000.

[13] Does not include $700,000 appropriated for military support of South Vietnam.

[14] Includes authorization amendments ($97,000,000 addition to Air Force missiles for Minuteman, $974,000 addition to Navy shipbuilding, and $200,000,000 for Navy R.D.T.&E.). These amendments were received subsequent to, and therefore not considered in, House authorization action.

[15] Includes $221,000,000 fiscal year 1976 supplemental authorization for repair and modernization of the U.S.S. Belknap guided missile cruiser.

[16] Includes the July 13, 1977, supplemental authorization for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $404,970,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[17] Includes the Febuary [illegible], 1979, amended supplemental authorization request for procurement and R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $2,002,200,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[18] Includes the Mar. 11, 1981, supplemental authorization request for procurement, R.D.T.&E. in the amount of $2,958,594,000 as well as subsequent congressional action.

[19] Does not include supplemental authorization request for fiscal year 1982 for procurement, R.D.T.&E. and operation and maintenance in the amount of $1,451,800,000.

NOTES.—During fiscal years 1964 and 1965 tracked combat vehicles were not subject to authorization action.

During fiscal years 1964, 1965, and 1966 the emergency fund under R&D was not subject to authorization action.

Authorization for other weapons was not required prior to fiscal year 1971.

Authorization for torpedoes and related support equipment was not required prior to fiscal year 1972.

Authorization for civil defense was not required prior to fiscal year 1978.

Authorization for operation and maintenance was not required prior to fiscal year 1982.

Authorization for ammunition and other procurement was not required prior to fiscal year 1983.

Authorization for working capital funds was not required prior to fiscal year 1985.

RELATIONSHIP OF ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

History of Section 138, Title 10, United States Code

(Superseding "Section 412")

The jurisdiction of the committee so far as specific annual authorizations are concerned was increased significantly in 1959 by the enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149 which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. That law was amended and expanded as follows:

In 1962 (Public Law 87–436) to require similar authorization of appropriations for research, development, test, or evaluation associated with aircraft missiles, and naval vessels;

In 1963 (Public Law 88–174) to require authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test, or evaluation carried on by the Department of Defense;

In 1965 (Public Law 89–37) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

In 1967 (Public Law 90–168) to require annual authorization of the personnel strengths of each of the Selected Reserves of the Reserve components as a prior condition for the appropriation of funds for the pay and allowances for the Reserve components;

In 1969 (Public Law 91–121) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of other weapons to or for the use of any armed force of the United States. (Essentially, heavy, medium, and light artillery, antiaircraft artillery, rifles, machineguns, mortars, small arms weapons, and any crew-fired piece using fixed ammunition);

In 1970 (Public Law 91–441) to require authorization of appropriations to or for the use of the Navy for the procurement of torpedoes and related support equipment; and to require authorization of the average annual active duty personnel strength for each component of the Armed Forces as a condition precedent to the appropriation of funds for this purpose;

In 1972 (Public Law 92–436) to require annual authorization for the average military training student loads for each component of the Armed Forces, and modified the provisions relating to authorization for active duty personnel strength;

In 1973 (Public Law 93–155) to require authorization for end strength civilian employment for each component of the Defense Department in each fiscal year;

In 1975 (Public Law 94–106) to require the annual authorization of military construction of ammunition facilities;

In 1980 (Public Law 96–342) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for the operation and maintenance of any armed force or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1981; and

In 1982 (Public Law 97-86) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for procurement of ammunition or other procurement for any armed force or for agencies of the Department of Defense (other than military departments).

Also, in 1973 these enactments were codified by section 803(a) of Public Law 93-155 into Title 10, United States Code, as section 138. The law today reads as follows:

SEC. 138. ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR THE ARMED FORCES; ANNUAL MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS AND OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REPORTS

(a) No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for—

(1) procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels;

(2) any research, development, test, or evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto;

(3) procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

(4) procurement of other weapons;

(5) mprocurement of naval torpedoes and related support equipment;

(6) military construction (as defined in subsection (f)); or

(7) the operation and maintenance of any armed forces or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

(8) procurement of ammunition; or

(9) other procurement by any armed force or by the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

unless funds therefor have been specifically authorized by law.

(b)(1) Congress shall authorize the average personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members on any reserve component of the armed forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members on any reserve component of the armed forces unless the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of that reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress each year, not late than February 15, a written report concerning the equipment of the National Guard and the reserve components of the armed forces for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Each such report shall include—

(A) recommendations as to the type and quantity of each major item of equipment which should be in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component of the armed forces;

(B) the quantity and average age of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be physically available in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve coimponent as of the beginning of each fiscal year covered by the report;

(C) the quantity and cost of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be procured for the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and each reserve component from commercial sources or to be transferred to each such Selected Reserve from the active-duty components of the armed forces; and

(D) the quantity of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be retired, decommissioned, transferred, or otherwise removed from the physical inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each reserve component and the plans for replacement of that equipment.

The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared and expressed in the same format and with the same level of detail as the information presented in the annual Five Year Defense Program Procurement Annex prepared by the Department of Defense.

REGULATORY IMPACT

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of a bill be included in the report on such bill. The committee finds that in the case of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986, there is no regulatory impact.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XXVI, Paragraph 12 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report since, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in existing law separately in the report in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. COHEN

In 1983, the Congress and the Administration crafted an integrated weapons modernization-arms control package. This continues to represent a viable basis for the maintenance and further development of consensus on strategic issues. The Administration has since placed increasing emphasis on strategic defense. Continued domestic consensus will, in my view, require that the relationship between offensive and defensive weapons systems be addressed in a more thorough manner than has heretofore been the case.

MX AND SMALL ICBM'S

The MX needs to be considered in the overall strategic framework. It remains, in my view, a transition system. Its production and deployment must be moderated to be consistent with the U.S. objective of linking arms reduction with weapons modernization. It this context, a limited number of MX missiles will suffice to keep open the only active U.S. ICBM production line while we move toward more stabilizing weapons and significant reduction in both Soviet and U.S. arsenals.

In keeping with this, I am supporting the procurement of a limited number of additional MX missiles this year, but I continue to explore possible further limits on production and deployment of the MX at levels below those which the Administration is seeking in fiscal years 1986 and beyond. I also continue my strong support of the Small ICBM Program to develop a small, single-warhead ICBM weighing about 30,000 pounds capable of being deployed in a variety of basing modes, including hardened mobile transporter/launchers. Additionally, I maintain my support for the Follow-on Basing program to develop alternative basing modes for ICBMs, including the Small ICBM.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE (SDI)

I continue to have reservations about aspects of the Strategic Defense Initiative and its implications for U.S. security, alliance relations and international stability. The Committee has yet to receive a coherent explanation of the objectives and implications of the program. Serious and reasonable concerns raised by our allies, for example, have yet to be addressed with clarity.

I continue to support research and development permitted under the ABM Treaty as a deterrent to and a hedge against Soviet abrogation of the Treaty. In my view, the committee should continue to examine the extent to which expenditures for research on "exotic" technologies diverts funding from research programs aimed at hedging against Soviet near-term actions. There has been much discussion of what activities the Treaty permits and prohibits. Stating that certain activities are merely "research" does not make them

Treaty-permissible and avoids critical definitional issues that may to be addressed more thoroughly. Pursuing activities which raise questions regarding strict U.S. adherence to the Treaty would only undermine U.S. efforts to ensure an accurate public understanding of Soviet activities that appear to violate the Treaty and the implications of the Soviet policy underlying those activities.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

It is U.S. policy to vigorously pursue a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons while, until such a ban is achieved, maintaining a viable deterrent. This policy represents our best option for ensuring that chemical weapons are never used.

The U.S. and U.S.S.R., as countries with significant chemical weapons capabilities, can and should play a leading role in moving toward a worldwide ban on these weapons last year, Senator Biden and I introduced a Senate resolution commending the President for his efforts on the multilateral level to achieve a comprehensive chemical weapons ban and urging that he continue these efforts and extend them to the bilateral level with the Soviet Union. Forty senators joined us in co-sponsoring this resolution. Last summer, bilateral discussions took place at the initiative of the U.S. This year, we have introduced a similar Senate resolution urging continuation and development of these discussions.

The question of how to maintain a viable deterrent has aroused understandably strong emotions regarding such matters as the safety of our present deterrent force, terminating the unilateral U.S. moratorium on chemical weapons production, and the acceptability, to allied nations of new chemical munition deployments. In my view, advocates of modernization need to undertake a greater educational effort to address these issues. Failure to do so could heighten misperception of the modernization program and, ironically, even lead to an erosion of public support for maintenance of our current deterrent force. Opponents of modernization need to take greater account of another irony: the lack of a viable deterrent will only make more likely that which we all seek to prevent—the use of chemical weapons in a conflict involving the U.S.—and less likely that which we all seek to promote—the negotiation of a comprehensive chemical weapons ban.

William S. Cohen.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. HART

I voted in favor of final passage of this bill, but did so with severe reservations and in order to bring the annual authorization bill before the entire Senate. As it stands, the bill continues a dangerous emphasis in military spending on "big-ticket" weapons procurement of limited military utility at the expense of other, far more pressing security needs—such as redressing conventional force deficiencies, enhancing readiness, and providing adequately for military personnel. Training, ammunition, spare parts, and military pay all get comparatively shortchanged, and we continue to buy inadequate numbers of very expensive weapons, especially in critical categories such as attack submarines. In its present form, the bill does not allocate our resources wisely, and thus will not enhance our security.

At a time when the need for fiscal austerity in Congress has never been greater, there is simply no justification for exempting the military procurement budget from the careful scrutiny applied to other federal programs. I supported a zero percent real growth increase in funding over FY 85, instead of the three percent real growth reflected in this bill. This year's defense budget is unquestionably inflated, and with a more careful and responsible allocation of resources, the overall rate of growth could have easily stayed within the zero percent ceiling without jeopardizing our national security. If we act to reduce the growth rate to zero by terminating programs for weapons which don't work, or don't make a significant contribution to our security, we can both save money and strengthen our armed forces.

In committee, I supported numerous amendments aimed at forging a more balanced and rational approach to strategic and conventional military modernization—none of which passed. Ultimately, I voted in favor of the bill in order to provide the Senate a vehicle to amend. I intend to submit a number of amendments on the Senate floor.

Beyond these general reservations with the structure and emphasis of this bill, I have a number of serious disagreements with some specific recommendations. They include:

STRATEGIC MODERNIZATION

One of the most striking flaws in this report is its approach to the modernization of the land-based leg of the strategic nuclear triad. Once again, the committee has voted to continue the MX missile program despite the clear indication that the missile will be no more survivable in fixed silos than it was when the committee rejected funding for such a basing mode in 1983. Once again, political, rather than military, arguments have dominated the debate over funding for the MX. In my view these vague political arguments cannot justify continuing a program which clearly will not strengthen our deterrent capabilities and which comes at the expense of truly pressing conventional military requirements. I intend to join several of my colleagues in an attempt to reverse this decision on the Floor of the Senate.

In addition, I have reservations about the committee's report language with respect to the small ICBM—or "Midgetman" missile—as it leaves open the possibility that the system could ultimately be MIRVed or placed in fixed silos. Such action would contradict the most fundamental objectives of the program, as delineated by the Scowcroft Commission. I strongly oppose any effort to subvert the initial concept behind the small-mobile IBCM, either by increasing its dimensions, its throwweight, or its warhead number, or by placing the missile in fixed, vulnerable silos. The explicit purpose of this new ICBM is to provide the United States with an invulnerable single-warhead, mobile missile. The original concept for the system—with a strict weight limit and mobile basing mode—are all integral requirements for achieving survivability.

STRATEGIC DEFENSE

The committee's action with respect to the SDI is also extremely troubling. I support continued, active research into ballistic missile defenses to provide a credible hedge against the possibility of Soviet breakout of the ABM Treaty. The committee's allocation of $3.4 billion for FY86—an increase over last year's funding of over 145 percent—is entirely unwarranted. A number of prominent defense experts have stated that a research program cannot allocate or spend efficiently more than a 35%-40% annual funding increase. In that context, the increase mandated by the committee is dramatically out of proportion and bound to be wasteful.

Furthermore, I oppose the committee's emphasis on near-term technology demonstrations and prototype development for the SDI. Such programs tend to freeze development of immature technologies, drain resources from basic research, and may test the continued viability of the ABM treaty.

Finally, to date the Administration has not been able to explain whether we are investing in defensive technologies simply as a hedge against Soviet break-out of ABM, as a means to add to our overall capabilities at hard point defense, or, as the President has suggested to render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete". In light of the serious implications for strategic stability, for arms control, and for the overall direction of our strategic posture, we should not fund the type of dramatic increase in the SDI account contained in this authorization bill until these objectives have been clarified.

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

I take strong exception to the committee's decision to authorize funds for the production of binary chemical weapons. For five years, the Reagan Administration has tried to resume production of binaries, and each year the request has been denied by Congress. Additions to the current chemical arsenal are not necessary for our national security because the United States can deter a Soviet chemical first strike with the existing stockpile. The most pressing requirement in this area is the need for improvement in US capacilities to defend against chemical attack.

No compelling arguments were made in committee to suggest that anything has changed sufficiently to warrant an alteration in current policy. I will seek to amend the authorization bill on the floor of the Senate to prohibit expenditures on binary chemical weapons and to fund instead improvements in defenses against chemical attack.

ASAT

Unrestricted funding provided for research, development and procurement of three miniature homing vehicle antisatellite systems is unwise. The military rationale for moving ahead with ASAT testing and deployment at this point remains extremely weak, especially in light of the ongoing negotiations in Geneva on these systems. When many vital defense and intelligence activities depend upon reconnaisance and communications satellites, taking steps which will invariably lead to threats to the survivability of those satellites makes no sense.

The better course of action would be to negotiate mutual restraints with the Soviet Union to freeze ASAT capabilities at their current levels—before either side has the capacity to credibly threaten vital military and early warning satellites. Continuing a moratorium on ASAT testing as long as the Soviets demonstrate equal restraint would be a positive step toward achieving that goal and is clearly in the national security interest of the United States.

BASE CLOSURES

The decision of this committee to allow the Department of Defense to bypass Congressional review in the process of closing military bases is highly questionable. Careful assessments of the impact which base closures will have on the surrounding community are essential, and public participation in the decision-making process must not be bypassed. Moreover, savings from these closures seem insignificant by comparison to the overall costs which will be imposed by resulting economic dislocations. Once again, the committee's actions reflect a willingness to sacrifice the needs of the men and women in our military to pay for unnecessary and expensive weapon systems.

SEAPOWER

Once again the committee has approved the perpetuation of an outdated naval force structure. If the Navy's plans are allowed to go forward, we may spend as much as $100 billion for Aegis ships by the end of the century—ships that do nothing but defend our few big carriers from air attack. It is not clear that Aegis works, and even if it does, the tremendous quantity of money it will absorb will mean continued weakness in capital ships—that is, submarines. The submarines, not the aircraft carrier, is today's capital ship. In part because of the Navy's over-reliance on the big carrier, the Soviets outnumber us three to one in submarines. Part of that numerical deficiency is also due to the kind of submarine we build, which is both too big and too expensive. The projected new attack submarine, the SSN-21, will be so expensive—$1.6 billion for the first few, supposedly dropping to "only" $1 billion for follow-on boats, with all prices in current dollars—that our already inadequate submarine force will probably grow still smaller. In addition, the increased size of the SSN-21 would appear to raise questions about its vulnerability to non-acoustic means of detection.

In allowing the Navy to go forward in building what looks increasingly like the world's largest and most expensive museum, rather than a modern fleet, the committee is not doing its duty to the nation.

Overall, this bill tends to perpetuate business as usual. The committee has made only cosmetic changes in the budget submitted by the President, and has by-in-large refused to make the difficult choices needed to strengthen our defenses and rein in excessive and wasteful defense expenditures.

GARY HART.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. LEVIN

It is with some reluctance that I voted against reporting out our committee's version of the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act. There are some positive aspects to the bill which should contribute to improving our national security. Unfortunately, there are too many negative aspects which could have the opposite result.

Neither the American taxpayers nor our total defense posture are well served by approval of this legislation without significant revisions. I voted against reporting out the bill because the committee should have made these revisions to achieve the objective we all share—enhancing our overall security within reasonable fiscal constraints.

In a number of areas of military preparedness, this bill continues to make progress in improving our conventional combat readiness, although the overall result is still inadequate.

At the same time, the bill continues to overemphasize strategic nuclear weapons programs which are militarily unjustified and unnecessary.

The committee continues to approve the MX missile, a weapon whose lack of survivability is dangerous in a crisis and whose utility as a bargaining chip or bargaining leverage in any arms control talks is greatly diminished because of that very fact.

With only a minor reduction, the committee still approved an increase of approximately 140 percent in the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] budget. Such a diversion of scarce funds away from our conventional forces cannot be justified militarily, especially for a program whose arms control, foreign policy, and military implications are causing such serious concerns.

The United States and its allies have yet to give adequate consideration to these implications, and whether the SDI will ultimately make all our nations more or less secure. While we should proceed with some research—and at an increased level—we should not rush forward pell mell as our committee does in this bill.

Our attempts to solve the significant defense problems we now face down here on Earth will mean much more for the security of ourselves and our children in the next two decades than will any efforts to achieve a visionary panacea in space many years after the turn of the century.

Approval of these huge, questionable strategic warfare programs came as the committee cut hundreds of millions of dollars from unglamorous conventional readiness accounts, such as Army and Air Force aircraft spares, mine countermeasures ships and Navy support equipment. Such reductions are a disturbing testament to improper defense priorities.

The committee erred further in deciding to approve the fiscal year 1986 bill at a total spending level representing 3 percent real growth above the fiscal year 1985 defense budget. That growth level is unnecessary and unrealistic.

Real growth in defense spending now has occurred for the last 6 years, a period of continuous growth in peacetime military budgets almost unprecedented in recent U.S. history. In the past 5 years, that growth after inflation has averaged 8.3 percent. With that financial foundation, our national security would certainly not be hurt by less than 3 percent real growth in fiscal year 1986, providing we spend our defense dollars wisely. The Senate Budget Committee recognized this when it reported the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 and provided for no real growth for defense.

Lastly, I particularly object to the process by which the committee considered and approved a major amendment to this legislation which would drastically amend existing statutes in several areas. Without holding hearings and without even receiving guidance from the executive branch departments most concerned—Defense, Justice and Labor—the committee has proposed major overhauls of the Davis-Bacon Act, the Walsh-Healy Act, the Monroney amendment and contracting out procedures.

The same amendment would also amend the criminal laws relating to companies doing business with DOD. I support the effort to get tougher with defense contractors who intentionally try to cheat the taxpayers, and I have helped lead that effort. But I do not believe criminal laws should be changed without hearings and without consultation with the Justice Department. We should continue to insure that all American citizens, defense contractors or otherwise, are treated with due process and do not face felony sanctions in the absence of a showing of criminal intent. Yet elimination of an "intent to defraud the Government" standard seems to be the effect of Section 702(d).

These revisions were written in such haste that in one instance it appears we are actually weakening an existing sanction instead of making it tougher. That seems to be the effect of Section 702(b).

The committee rejected a proposal to postpone deliberation of the amendment in question for only 2 weeks to permit some hearings and consultation. Such a postponement would not have prevented us from reporting out the bill, to which we could have chosen to add a committee amendment after hearings. That suggestion was the much more prudent course of action to follow. The refusal to consider that course and the severe time restrictions imposed during markup for discussion and amendment exacerbated the total absence of hearings on these sweeping changes in our criminal and civil laws.

Turning to the postive components of the bill, one which could be overlooked because of its complexity is my amendment to reduce the chances for conflicts of interest by Defense Department employees who manage major weapons programs.

By and large, the individuals who manage these programs for the taxpayer are honorable people, as are most of their colleagues in the defense industry. Management mistakes are made on both sides, and those mistakes can waste millions of dollars, but the individuals involved usually err out of honest misjudgment, incompetence, or because the entire weapons acquisition system is so large and complex that the process prevents better stewardship.

Yet there are individuals whose failure to recognize conflicts of interest requires additional safeguards to reduce the potential for abuses in what is known as the revolving door practice—DOD procurement officials who leave public service to work for the very companies whose programs they have managed.

My amendment to the fiscal year 1986 authorization would reduce the conflicts of interest too often present in the revolving door by prohibiting DOD employees who are overseeing contracts with private industry from simultaneously discussing future employment for themselves with that same industry, under threat of civil penalty and a 2-year prohibition on accepting any outside position with such industry.

Another positive aspect of the bill which could be overlooked because it involves so few dollars is the small but important step taken toward increasing the understanding of high-ranking American and Soviet military and civilian defense offficals about each Nation's different strategic military motives, intentions, capabilities and safeguards, especially in the nuclear weapons arena.

In a 1983 letter cosigned by more than 50 of our Senate colleagues, I and Senator Nunn urged the President to establish a program of exchange visits between military personnel of the United States and the U.S.S.R. In June 1984, President Reagan emphasized the importance of "reducing the threat and use of force in solving international disputes" and suggested "regular high level contacts between military personnel of our two countries."

At my urging, the committee earmarked $100,000 in this bill to support a pilot program of exchange visits for high-ranking American and Soviet military and civilian defense officials, with the goal of helping to reduce military tensions between our countries. With both sides poised to launch immense nuclear arsenals, the people responsible for those arsenals should take all necessary steps to avoid tragic miscalculations.

CARL LEVIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. KENNEDY

I voted to report this legislation to the Senate floor because I believe it contains important provisions that will help strengthen the security of the United States, especially in the area of our conventional forces. At the same time, I have serious objections to a number of measures contained in the bill, particularly with respect to the level of spending authorized and key strategic programs, including MX, SDI, and chemical weapons.

I believe that the Congress can fulfill its obligation to provide for the national defense within a budget that is limited to a cost-of-living increase for the Pentagon in budget authority. Even with such a limit, outlays—actual spending—would continue to grow significanty in real terms. After providing for substantial real growth over the last few years, a period of consolidation—particularly in our procurement programs—is warranted. We can continue to provide for real growth in readiness, sustained progress in research and an adequate pay raise within the zero real growth target approved by the Budget Committee. I regret that the committee rejected my motion to report this bill at the Budget Committee level, an issue that will certainly be revisited by the full Senate.

I continue to oppose any funding for the MX missile program. The rationale for this missile shifts almost as frequently as its proposed basing modes. The MX is vulnerable, wasteful, and dangerous. It threatens to drain needed funds from necessary strategic and conventional programs. If, however, the Congress continues with MX, it is vital that we place a firm limit both on the continued rate of production and on the number and rate of deployment of the missiles. By capping the program, we can limit the destabilizing effects of the missile, opening the door to potential arms control solutions and keep pressure on for more desirable strategic systems, like the single warhead mobile missile.

The $3.4 billion authorization for the Strategic Defense Initiative (coupled with yet another nearly $400 million in funding through the Department of Energy) is wholly unjustified in terms of sound investment in research, and the program itself represents a dangerous gamble with our security. We do need an appropriate level of research into defensive technologies, to keep abreast of state-of-the-art developments which may have broad applicability and to hedge against a Soviet breakout from the ABM Treaty. But as former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger testified before the committee, increases of more than 35 percent in research funding are unlikely to be put to productive use; yet, the committee mark represents nearly 150-percent growth. Moreover, the program is laden with costly demonstrations designed more for generating headlines than for genuinely advancing research. These demonstrations are not only wasteful, but also are unnecessarily provocative efforts to test the line between permitted research and prohibited development and testing under the ABM Treaty. I therefore welcome the committee's explicit recognition of the need to conform SDI research to the ABM Treaty.

Any decision to deploy defensive systems would necessitate modification or abrogation of the ABM Treaty and would be a serious threat to nuclear stability. In our pursuit of this research we must not unwittingly commit ourselves to a course that kindles new arms races in offensive and defensive weapons, thus bringing the world closer to, not further from the brink of nuclear war. Let there be no illusion: The possibility of making nuclear weapons obsolete through "Star Wars" technology is wildly unrealistic, and the role of deterrence is too important to be abandoned in pursuit of the phantom of a foolproof space defense. In the years to come, Congress must provide leadership to assure that the reality of mutual deterrence is not lost in Star Wars visions of laser weapons and particle beams.

For the third time in 4 years this committee has approved funds for the production of new chemical weapons. On two previous occasions, the Senate's action was overturned by the conference committee. Last year this committee itself declined to fund new production of chemical weapons.

The issue of chemical deterrence is a serious one. Just as we know that our ability to deter against a nuclear attack depends on the enemy's knowledge of our ability to retaliate, so, too, a retaliatory capability is essential to chemical deterrence. We cannot depend on protective gear or other defensive measures alone to deter an enemy from initiating the use of chemical weapons. Moreover, it would seriously disadvantage our forces if they were forced to fight in highly restrictive chemical defensive equipment while our opponents were not so encumbered.

But having acknowledged those facts, the case for producing new binary weapons has not been made. Despite repeated assertions by both uniformed and civilian DOD officials, there has been no retraction of comments by Secretary Weinberger and others just a few years ago that our current stockpile is adequate for deterrence at present. Indeed, for some of the new munitions, the administration's plan is to substitute them for older unitary rounds on a one-for-one basis. This may arguably improve safety, but it does not improve deterrence.

A second concern is the issue of where these new munitions will be deployed. Our European allies have failed to express any willingness to consider forward deployment of the new munitions on their soil. It is difficult to understand the deterrent value of a weapons system that is not readily available and will be difficult to deploy in a timely and effective fashion. The claimed urgency of the need for the new munitions is obviously undermined by our allies' lack of enthusiasm, since they too are facing the same threat.

The United States took the lead in unilaterally establishing a moratorium on chemical weapons production under President Nixon. It has offered a treaty in Geneva to ban all production of chemical weapons. Any move now to resume chemical production in these circumstances would be an abandonment of our historic leadership to end chemical warfare, and should only be taken under the most compelling showing of threat to our national security. This showing has not been made—and Congress should continue the current moratorium.

The committee also voted to authorize funds for continued testing of the U.S. antisatellite weapons system. I regret this action, because I believe that the United States has a unique opportunity to take advantage of the de facto moratorium on ASAT testing by both the United States and the U.S.S.R. to reach an interim agreement to ban or limit these weapons. Given the importance of our communications, command and control, early warning, reconnaissance, navigation and weather satellites, effective limits on ASAT's are surely in our interest.

I also oppose the committee's support for new nuclear weapons programs for the Navy—particularly the interceptor missile SM-2(N) and the new nuclear depth charge. The Navy has failed to make any convincing argument for the military utility of these systems, and the request is contrary to our efforts to raise, rather than reduce the nuclear threshold.

With respect to conventional forces, the committee bill is more balanced, although the task was eased by adopting the 3-percent real growth level. I believe, however, that the zero growth level can be achieved without significant additional cuts in our conventional forces. This fact was dramatically illustrated by the committee's own analysis of the 0-percent real growth level. Although the cut from 3 percent to 0 percent required reducing the production rate for some weapons systems and canceling some marginal programs, the overall result was consistent with meeting our conventional force requirements.

I am deeply concerned about the committee's approach to our servicemen and women. Throughout our markup this year, there was a disturbing tendency to take for granted the real improvements we have made in the quality of our service personnel. Rather than learn from the mistakes of the seventies, we are beginning to repeat them. After providing significant pay raises in 1981 and 1982 that finally brought the military close to parity with the civilian sector, we have capped military pay below comparability for the fourth year in a row. I offered an amendment in committee to make the 3 percent pay raise effective October 1, 1985, rather than January 1, 1986, as ultimately adopted by the committee. Even with this amendment, military pay would continue to fall farther and farther behind what is needed for comparability. We have seen the warning signs in the Army's failure to meet its targets for the Delayed Entry Program. If we continue down this path, we will soon see direct shortfalls in recruiting and retention. If we can afford to provide real growth funding for weapon systems, surely we can afford a cost of living increase for the most important component of our military strength—our servicemen and women.

Finally, during the final hours of our markup, the committee approved in a 10-to-9 vote a package of amendments offered by Senator Gramm. These amendments, which provide sweeping changes in procurement policy, labor relations, property disposal, and base closing, were never subject to hearings in the committee. They were never offered or debated at the subcommittee level. They were adopted under tactics that limited debate and discussion to 1 hour in the full committee. Whatever the merits of the proposal—and some may well have merit—it is inexcusable to ram through provisions that take far-reaching steps such as changing the standards of criminal intent for fraud or repealing the application of the National Environmental Policy Act to base closings. This preemptory and unfair action stands in marked contrast to the thoughtful deliberations on the rest of the bill.

On a positive note, I am encouraged that the committee accepted an amendment developed by Senator Hart, Senator Bingaman, and myself to increase funding in the Department of Energy and in DARPA for research on arms control verification with particular respect to seismic monitoring and verification. Recent advances in this area offer significant promise for extending our confidence in the verifiability of nuclear testing agreements, including a low threshold or comprehensive test ban. These funds represent an important contribution to achieving progress on this crucial issue.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BINGAMAN

OVERALL SPENDING LEVEL

My vote this year on the overall level of defense spending was dictated primarily by my growing concern about the unprecendented federal deficit which we are facing this year and in future years. The deficit is causing tremendous distortions in our economy. For example, this nation has become a net debtor to other nations for the first time since 1917 as we have sought foreign capital to finance the deficit. Our trade deficit exceeds $100 billion, and many industries, such as agriculture and minerals, have been left out of our recovery. Our security ultimately depends on the health of our economy. And our economy can not remain healthy and growing for long unless we take strong measures to reduce the deficit. I therefore have been supporting efforts to restrain federal spending across the board, both defense and domestic.

The committee took a very sound approach to developing the overall defense spending level. By working out three different budgets, one granting an inflation increase only as proposed by the Budget Committee, a second allowing 3 percent growth above inflation or $9.8 billion more than the first option, and a third granting 4 percent growth above inflation or $13.6 billion more than the first option, we were seeking to understand what we had to give up in each budget account as we went to the lower spending levels.

I think that the exercise demonstrated that the additional $9.8 billion which we plan to spend at the 3 percent real growth level buy relatively little additional security. We can afford to defer these marginal defense programs as part of the effort to deal with the federal deficit. And with a $302.5 billion "no real growth" budget for national security programs we would still be able to continue our defense modernization at a rapid pace. Indeed, in the inflation-increase-only budget which we developed, there were significant increases in procurement of many weapons systems over last year's levels.

For example, last year Congress authorized and appropriated funds to procure 749 combat and combat support aircraft. This year DOD requested funds to buy 807 aircraft in the same categories. Even at the inflation-increase-only level, we planned to authorize purchase of 791 aircraft—42 more than last year and only 16 aircraft fewer than the request. There were one year slips in minor aircraft systems, such as training aircraft. But they were only one year stretchouts.

At the inflation-increase-only level our markup still authorized twice as many EA-6B aircraft as last year, 8 more AV-8Bs, 30 more F-16s, 14 more B-1s, 6 more C-5s and 4 more CH-53s.

In the shipbuilding account, not a single combatant ship was cut at the inflation-increase-only level. Four non-combatants—two mine countermeasure ships, one oiler and one crane ship conversion—were postponed for one year.

The threat-based munitions accounts—especially sophisticated munitions such as air-to-air missiles, anti-ship missiles, and so forth—were almost entirely unaffected at the inflation-increase-only level because of the priority the committee placed on these programs. Except for AMRAAM which the Secretary of Defense has temporarily suspended because of cost problems, only 12 missiles out of 120,130 were cut from the request at this level. The markup at the inflation-increase-only level in fact provided for significant increases over last year's budget in these accounts. Navy tactical missiles increased by more than 66 percent, Air Force tactical missiles by 45 percent, and Army tactical missiles by 43 percent.

At the inflation-increase-only level, about the only truly painful cuts in the procurement account came in the Army's weapons and tracked combat vehicle account. The Army's M1 tank production rate was cut back from 840 to 720. The 197 field artillery ammunition support vehicles were postponed by one year. These two actions saved $400 million. The cut in the tank line, however, will increase the cost of the total program. And since the M1 tank is being produced at one of the most efficient production rates, we would have been penalizing the Army for their efficiency.

Frankly, we could have avoided even those cuts. As I noted, those two actions saved some $400 million. Yet in fiscal year 1984 over $2.4 billion of prior year budget authority for procurement in DOD lapsed because the Department could not spend it on the programs which were authorized. As of the date of our markup, over $450 million in contract savings have been identified this year in DOD for which the Department is seeking reprogramming authority. Clearly we could have just as easily applied these savings to the 120 tanks and 197 FAASVs.

I hope that the Senate as a whole in the upcoming debate on the First Concurrent Budget Resolution will look seriously at the inflation-increase-only alternative as we seek to restrict Federal spending across the board and deal with our massive Federal deficit.

BASE CLOSURES

One of the most controversial provisions included in the bill would allow the Secretary of Defense to realign military bases as he sees fit with only a 60-day notice to Congress whenever the Federal budget is in deficit. This provision would essentially place the entire $9.1 billion military construction budget at the Secretary's disposal with the only check being the remote possibility that both the House and Senate could pass blocking legislation during the 60-day period and override a likely veto. And the Congress does not even need to be in session during the 60-day notice period under the base closure provision included in this bill.

I would like to have been in a position to support legislation making it more possible to close bases. I believe our chairman, Senator Goldwater, is right that currently the impediments to closures of unneeded bases are too severe. But the answer should not be a blanket transfer of all authority and responsibility for base realignments to the executive branch. We do not remove base closures from politics by doing that. Indeed, we give the executive branch a powerful political tool to keep individual Senators and Congressmen in line on critical votes, and not just in the defense area.

We need hearings to develop a better approach to the base closure issue. As ranking minority member of the military construction subcommittee, I can attest to the lack of hearings either on the provision included in this bill or on the merits of closing any of the 22 bases on the notional list provided by Secretary Weinberger to the chairman on March 5.

While the committee was engaged in the markup of this bill, we obtained the first real information on how the illustrative list was put together. According to the figures contained in Secretary Weinberger's April 1 letter to the chairman, it would cost $2.47 billion over the next 6 years to close these 22 bases and it would be 1995 before that cost would be amortized even with expediting legislation of the sort included in this bill. For some of the bases included in the list the amortization period is as long as 25 years. For others it is as short as 2 to 5 years.

Surely we should be giving priority to closing those bases with the shorter amortization period and we should be questioning the wisdom of closing bases where we must wait 25 years to see a return on our investment. Under the provisions of this bill, the Congress will not have much say in such matters.

THE NEED FOR A LONGER TERM VIEW

Finally, I would like to highlight the need for the Congress to make its decisions on individual defense programs in a longer term context. We lack that context today.

Central to the problem has been an unwillingness on the part of the administration to accept the fact that outyear defense budgets are not going to grow at 6 to 8 percent above inflation. Within the outyear budgets which were presented to the Congress this February and in the previous four Februarys, everything seemed possible to do. As a result, the Defense Department has already made choices about starting new programs, choices which only make sense in the context of continued rapid growth in defense spending. And we in Congress have ratified those choices without adequate consideration of the outyear consequences. For my own part, I know that I might have voted differently on starting some of these programs had I had an honest assessment of their relative priority in the outyears. We now face the very real prospect, given our historic inability to terminate programs once they are started and constituencies have formed around them, of not being able to buy very many weapon systems at efficient rates for our forces come 1990.

We should today have in mind what our fiscal year 1990 budget will look like. And we should be deleting those marginal programs which will not fit within a realistic assessment of what that future administration and that future Congress will be willing to allocate to our national security programs.

The compromise reached by the President and the Senate Republican leadership on April 4 represents a long step toward defense budget reality from the budget submitted in February. I hope that we can receive a revised budget from the Pentagon, based on the new figures, in time for floor debate on this bill.

If the previous out-year budgets were heavily stocked with funding "wedges", perhaps there is no need today for consideration of program cancellations. If not, the very much lower spending now planned through fiscal year 1990 should have significant repercussions on the choices we are making this year.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

○

Calendar No. 91

99TH CONGRESS } SENATE { REPORT
1st Session } { 99-41

ERRATA

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

APRIL 29 (legislative day, APRIL 15), 1985.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1029]

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. EXON

The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 as reported by the Committee on the Armed Services represents an attempt to deal realistically with both our national security needs and limited funding. I regret that the committee was not more successful in this attempt.

Since I first became a member of the committee in 1979, I have consistently supported a strong national defense and advocated a sustained annual real growth of about 3 percent in defense spending. This year, however, I supported no real growth for the defense budget but would allow for inflation. I am of this view because I am convinced that we must deal with the Federal deficit in a serious manner. Reducing Federal spending in nondefense areas such as Social Security, retirement, housing, and scores of other programs which daily affect the lives of millions of Americans simply would not be fair without also restraining our defense spending. This is a year in which everyone must tighten their belts and agreements to do so are especially fragile. If we cannot freeze de-

S203-2

fense spending with an inflation allowance, it will be impossible to obtain reductions in other areas of spending.

This is my concern with a defense budget calling for 3 percent real growth next year, and it explains why I could not vote for the committee's recommendation. Instead, in the Budget Committee I supported efforts to hold defense spending to zero real growth in fiscal year 1986, followed by 3-percent real growth in both 1987 and 1988.

I recognize that we face a serious challenge from the Soviet military buildup. This is a challenge we cannot afford to ignore. Our security, however, depends upon more than just our Armed Forces. Indeed, it rests upon a sound economy—something that is in serious danger as long as our present deficit and level of government spending continues with little concern for what happens in the years ahead.

Limiting Federal spending is a difficult thing for us to do. Old habits are the hardest to control. A defense budget that still keeps unneeded military bases open, allows militarily questionable programs like the MX to rapidly go forth, and reduces needed growths in active duty military endstrength while adding to the fleet a fourth manpower-intensive battleship does not address this problem to the degree necessary. Furthermore, this bill emphasizes hardware at the expense of our servicemen, servicewomen, and their families. Instead of spending billions on the MX, we should be ensure that these dedicated and hardworking individuals receive pay and benefits equal to their personal sacrifice.

We simply must take a harder look at the years ahead of us. It is a fact that there will not be enough money available for all the defense programs we may want. The Senate will have to be very careful and selective in determining priorities. This requires looking especially hard at programs in the research and development stage for once unneeded weapons acquire a constituency of their own, it becomes impossible to stop them.

This bill, as reported by the committee, moves in the direction of dealing efficiently with limited resources, but not nearly enough. Unless defense spending is better controlled and monitored in the years ahead, we will lose what is our greatest national security asset, the determination and will of the American people to adequately provide for the defense of our Nation.

○